LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

NRA
WE DO OUR PART

The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXXXVIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1934 No. 3578

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 113
EDITORIALS:
Cuba and the New Deal 116
A Tariff Revolution? 117
When Mothers Die It's News 118
ISSUES AND MEN. THE PRESIDENT'S DISARMAMENT OPPORTUNITY. By Oswald Garrison Villard 119
LUXURY IN THE U. S. S. R. By Louis Fischer 120
THE DOLLAR: A POLITICAL TOY. By Henry Hazlitt . . . 122
HITLER DISSOLVES THE FASCIST UNIONS. By Ludwig Lore 124
WHAT PRICE TALL BUILDINGS? By Oliver Whitwell Wilson . 126
THE POWER INDUSTRY GOES NRA. By Jerome Count . . . 128
THE BIRTH-CONTROL CONFERENCE. By Stella Hanau . . . 129
THE INTELLIGENT TRAVELER. By John Rothschild 131
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 132
CORRESPONDENCE 132
FINANCE. WALL STREET PLAYS 'POSSUM. By Peter Helmoop Noyes 133
BOOKS AND DRAMA:
Winter Revery. By Sara Bard Field 134
Wanted: An Attitude. By Horace Gregory 134
Objet d'Art. By Florence Codman 134
Johnson's England. By Joseph Wood Krutch 135
Europe Before the War. By G. P. Gooch 136
The Southwest and Its People. By Mary Austin 137
Shorter Notices 137
The Dance: The Persistence of Ballet. By Lincoln Kirstein . . 138
Drama: Two Strange Plays. By Joseph Wood Krutch 140
CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE 140

BOARD OF EDITORS
ERNEST GRUENING FREDA KIRCHWEY
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH
ASSOCIATE EDITORS
MAURITZ A. HALLGREN MARGARET MARSHALL
DOROTHY VAN DOREN

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States; to Canada, $5.50; and to other foreign countries, $6.00.

THE NATION, No. 20 Vesey Street, New York City, Cable Address: NATION, New York. Muriel C. Gray, Advertising Manager. British Agent, Gertrude M. Cross, 23 Brunswick Square, W. C. 1, England.

WHEN the Tugwell-Copeland bill is threshed out on the floors of Congress, where will the publishers' lobby stand? Amusingly enough, it is just possible that when the roll is called, the publishers will have become so desperate that they will actually support the bill which Generalissimo C. C. Parlin of the Curtis Publishing Company and his food, drug, and patent-medicine allies have spent many months and plenty of expense accounts in fighting. For it is becoming increasingly clear that the publishers, by going along with the hysterical ballyhoo of Frank (Cascarets) Blair, Huston (Feenamint) Thompson, and Thomas (Crazy Crystals) Love, are finding themselves hoist by their own petard. The Parlin lobby has badly frightened advertisers who would not be affected by the Tugwell-Copeland bill. They are holding up contracts, so that the *Saturday Evening Post*, the *Ladies' Home Journal*, the *Country Gentleman*, and other mass publications are undernourished and unhappy. The publishers, allied with the food and drug interests, have prepared their own bill, the chief author being Charles Wesley Dunn, representing the Associated Grocery Manufacturers of America and the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association. A bill drawn by Dr. James H. Beal, representing the National Drug Trade Conference, has already been introduced. The patent-medicine buccaneers haven't been doing so well. J. Bruce Kremer is now an ex-National Democratic Committee member, and back of that "ex" is a sad story. In brief, when it got out that Mr. Kremer was representing simultaneously the people of Montana and the Drug Institute, Mr. Kremer found that he had stepped on a political banana peel. The Tugwell-Copeland bill has only about two teeth left, but both of them bite, and it can probably be passed if the consumer is heard from loudly and frequently. Write or telegraph. Do it now. Send no money. The papers probably won't do a thing for you, but the United States mails are still yours.

WE DO NOT SEE why the Federal Coordinator of Transportation, Joseph B. Eastman, should have gone to the trouble of outlining a plan for government ownership of railways so long as he was not ready to recommend its adoption at this time. Nor can we understand his argument that government ownership is not now desirable because it would involve large and unpredictable expenditures. Does he not realize that the country has rarely been so ready to indorse large and unpredictable expenditures as at present? Does he not know his Administration? For our part, even though government ownership as Mr. Eastman proposes it might be something of a gamble, we would sooner see the nation acquire the railroads in return for its money than sink millions in them as loans without obtaining control. For the present Mr. Eastman asks for few changes except the power to compel consolidations instead of merely to recommend them. A year ago financial circles were predicting the necessity of government acquisition of the railroads in order to prevent default on their bonds in such proportions as to carry the savings banks under. Since then the financial position of the railroads has improved somewhat, although their ultimate fate, of course, hinges on the strength of the recovery program. Whatever the wisdom of Mr. Eastman's recommendations, we agree with his prediction that if government ownership comes it will only be because private enterprise can no longer carry on. That has been the history of all government ownership in this country—federal, State, or municipal. Private ownership holds on as long as there is a possible chance to squeeze a penny out of an enterprise. When it is hopelessly bankrupt, the public is allowed to take it over. This has the double advantage of preserving private profits as long as possible and discrediting public ownership by permitting it only when it must function at a loss.

THE ADMINISTRATION of President Roosevelt, the nation, and the people of New York State are to be congratulated on the forthcoming retirement of James A. Farley from his chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee and of the Democratic State Committee. The Farley influence has been distinctly detrimental to the achievement of the New Deal. Mr. Farley is the spoilsman extraordinary of the Roosevelt Administration, and his political sagacity, since March 4, has materialized in placing in important positions deserving Democrats regardless of competence, but with a special regard for the date of their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adherence to the Roosevelt candidacy. Almost without exception, his appointments have been atrocious. His culminating injury to the Administration came when he managed to stampede his chief into assenting to the McKee candidacy in New York, the only result of which was to prevent the Fusionists from making a clean sweep. Mr. Farley is a typical boss of the old school, who as such has no place in an Administration that purports to be progressive and enlightened. Mayor LaGuardia has pointed out the obvious absurdity of having government dominated by, and its business transactions conducted through, a hierarchy of bosses, district leaders, and the like who are not elected by the people but have arrogated to themselves the perquisites and power of government.

WHEN THE PLANS for the Civil Works Administration were projected early in November, all sorts of promises were made that would evidently be difficult to fulfil. There was available $600,000,000 to finance the project; 4,000,000 persons were to be put to work by December 15; minimum wages were to range from forty to fifty cents an hour, but much higher wages were to be paid for skilled labor. A student in elementary arithmetic could have proved that the prevailing wage, with the funds available, could not exceed the minimum of fifty cents for the northern and eastern sections of the country, and that, even so, it would be difficult to make the funds last until February 15. Now it is announced that the funds will not last, and instructions have already been issued to cut hours and to fill no more jobs.

PRESSED for an explanation of why it was necessary to cut CWA wages and hours, Harry L. Hopkins, Federal Relief Administrator, declared that there had been an "original bad guess" about the size of pay rolls and about average pay. Mr. Hopkins said he had estimated the average weekly pay roll at $12, although how he figured that amount as payment for a thirty-hour week at fifty cents an hour is difficult to explain. But whatever the reason, funds are about gone. On January 18 CWA employees were put on a fifteen-hour week in small and rural communities and a twenty-four-hour week in cities of 2,500 or more population. In addition, instructions have been issued to drop CWA workers from the pay rolls at the rate of 500,000 a week, beginning February 15, to make the whole project end by May 1, $350,000,000 to be made available in the meanwhile from the emergency funds included in the budget. In New York City about 140,000 persons are employed under the CWA. In addition, 200,000 are registered for jobs which do not exist. It is plain that something drastic should be done to extend the employment-relief program and to bring it up to the needs of the people who are out of work. President Roosevelt, when asked for additional funds for Civil Works relief, announced himself as unwilling to include extra appropriations in his budget, and declared that the project must end by May 1 as proposed. Out of our budget of ten billion dollars for the next fiscal year large sums are evidently planned for relief of some sort. But it is not encouraging to have the whole matter left so vague and so uncertain. The Civil Works administrators plainly do not know where more money is coming from. The persons at work at from $7.50 a week up do not know what weekly pay check will be their last. Billions of dollars have been asked by Mr. Roosevelt for the RFC. If there are other billions, or even hundreds of millions, that are earmarked for relief, the country cannot be told too soon, in the plainest possible language, just how, for whom, and when the money will be spent.

ANNOUNCEMENT of the new German labor code can hardly have caused surprise in other countries. It was to be expected that the Hitlerites would "crack down" on the workers with all the force at their command. Nevertheless, the harshness of the terms of this "law for the organization of national labor" is such as to take one's breath. All the liberal labor laws and the splendid system of labor courts, built up over a period of years through the efforts of the trade-union movement, are abolished. The worker is stripped of all freedom of action. The right of collective bargaining is denied him. He may not join with his fellows in striking against an unfair employer or against low wages or poor working conditions. He may not join an independent union or even the shop council established in the business which employs him unless he is considered "nationally reliable." This council, moreover, is completely under the control of the employer or "leader" of the business. The leader is given full right to fix wages and working conditions, although the council may by a majority vote take an appeal to a state labor trustee if it feels it has a grievance. But since the council is made up of hand-picked employees, and since the labor trustee will be an official of the state which has drawn up these rigid regulations, it can hardly be supposed that this right of appeal will have any value for the average employee. The code is replete with glowing phrases designed to convey the impression that it is a genuinely socialistic measure. Actually, of course, it saddles upon the German worker all the hardships which his Russian colleague has been enduring, without giving him or even promising him any of the benefits of socialism.

MENACING as the Japanese militarists were when they held power unchallenged by public or press, they have become much more dangerous to the peace of the Far East with the recent reawakening of liberal and moderate sentiment in Japan. While they dominated Japanese political life and had public opinion almost solidly behind them, they had little need for propaganda or saber-rattling. In the last few months, however, the moderate element has taken on fresh courage, partly as the result of President Roosevelt's order withdrawing the Atlantic fleet from Pacific waters and partly because former Ambassador Debuchi and other diplomats and business men returning home from America have brought assurances that the United States is not even thinking of war with Japan. This has had a marked effect on many Japanese people. Indeed, so strong has the anti-militarist current become that the militarists feel they must resort to vigorous tactics in order to hold the public in line. In consequence the popular magazines and a section of the press have been flooded with articles, some of them signed by the highest navy and army officers, intended to re-create suspicion of America and Russia and to arouse the war passions of the Japanese people. On the one hand, the American navy is pictured as an ever-present menace to world peace in general and to the Japanese islands in particular. On the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other, the Japanese are reminded that Vladivostok is only 400 miles away by air; a bombing expedition could quickly wipe out the more important Japanese cities. It is suggested that it might be well to start a preventive war against Russia before this tragedy occurs. Given moral encouragement, the moderate element may yet triumph over the militarists. But such encouragement, on the part of the United States, requires that its public officials exercise the utmost tact and discretion; and the requisite discretion does not consist in the blatant demands for "a navy second to none" that have lately been pouring from the mouths of our Swansons, Brittens, Vinsons, and Admiral Standleys. The resignation of General Araki as Minister of War will apparently make no difference in Japanese policy, since General Hayashi, announced as his successor, is a militarist of the same school.

WHAT HAPPENS to labor in a period of industrial depression is set forth in figures lately published by the Department of Commerce on the loss of income sustained in this country from 1929 to 1932, inclusive. The total of income produced and distributed to individuals dropped from 81 billion dollars in 1929 to 49 billion in 1932, or about 40 per cent. But in this period the loss in wages was 60 per cent in those industries in which it was possible to segregate that item, while the decrease in income on property was 30 per cent. In other words, the industrial worker —with nothing to say about the conduct of the enterprise to which he gives his labor—nevertheless suffers more severely from its mismanagement than those who are financially interested in it and responsible for its direction. Doubtless in good time we shall learn the same in regard to the financial inflation with which it is now proposed to liquidate the depression. In so far as prices rise, they will soar more and sooner than wages and salaries, and will in effect be a sales tax falling mostly on the low-paid workers, as the most numerous class in the community. Thus both coming and going the poor man gets it in the pocket-book, while politicians and promoters make him smile and pretend that he likes it.

THE BATTLE against the avarice of the sugar-beet trust in the West has become so hot that some hope of victory for the forces of justice and decency seems to be rising. Throughout the whole sugar-beet country growers are in open revolt against the Great Western and its subsidiaries, to which they have so long been meek and humble lieges. Both the Mountain States Beet Growers' Association of Colorado and the Nonstock Cooperative Beet Growers' Association of Nebraska have recently demanded equality of profit with the sugar company, threatening a one-year production moratorium if the company refuses the demand. Even more significant was the action of the United States Beet Sugar Association in Salt Lake City on January 10, when it declared for the complete elimination of child labor in the beet fields. This organization of manufacturers has for its president W. D. Lippitt, president of the Great Western, which efficiently dominates the membership. Evidently the public clamor for common decency on the part of the sugar trust has begun to have results, but it would be unwise to be too optimistic about the outcome yet. The Great Western has many times proved itself to be a slippery customer. Much credit for the present hopeful outlook is due to Senator Edward P. Costigan of Colorado, whose influence has been on the side of humanity and justice. Senator Costigan is the sponsor of a bill in Congress, backed by Secretary Wallace, to amend the farm act to include sugar as a basic commodity and provide for a possible downward revision of tariff rates. The sugar trust, heretofore bitterly and outspokenly opposed to such legislation, has apparently begun to develop a faint heart for further battle. No action on the Costigan bill was taken by the Beet Sugar Association at the meeting in Salt Lake City.

THE NEW WALK-OUT of 30,000 insurgent miners in the Pennsylvania hard-coal fields is another thorn in the much-lacerated side of the National Labor Board, and it is all the more painful because the miners blame the board itself for their present difficulties. The strikers are members of the United Anthracite Miners' Union of Pennsylvania, which for two years has been at odds with the conservative policies of the United Mine Workers of America, their leader, John L. Lewis, and the American Federation of Labor. They ask only recognition of their own union, and in this cause went on strike last November. There followed three weeks of bloody warfare, which was halted when the National Labor Board agreed to investigate conditions in the anthracite region. But the investigation was carried on by the Anthracite Conciliation Board, made up of representatives of the operators and the old-line union, with the new union frozen out. The rebel miners called the findings of the inquiry a whitewash and walked out again, renewing their request for recognition. In the pending peace negotiations they are naturally at a decided disadvantage. The situation, it would seem, is an ideal one to reveal just what, if any, are the rights of independent or radical unions under the National Industrial Recovery Act.

IN ORDER to keep in line with modern enterprise *The Nation* is obliged to blow its own horn occasionally, and it feels specially inclined to emit a blast in connection with the practices of companies selling "guaranteed" mortgages which New York newspapers have been making public, as revealed in an official inquiry recently begun. When the New York State Superintendent of Insurance testified the other day that four of the larger mortgage companies had paid dividends right through the depression years of 1931 and 1932, although they stopped payments of interest and principal to mortgage-holders on January 1 of the latter year, the testimony was considered worthy of the front page. Nor does *The Nation* quarrel with this estimate. It merely wants to remind a forgetful world that it presented these facts in its issue of May 17 last in an article by Benedict A. Leerburger. The article brought out also that the Lawyers' Mortgage Company, the New York Title and Mortgage Company, and the Bond and Mortgage Guaranty Company increased their salary rolls in 1931 over those in 1930. The Bond and Mortgage Guaranty Company paid a dividend of 25 per cent in 1930 and one of 19 per cent in 1931. The other three of the "big four" were not far behind in their largess to stockholders while failing signally to protect their investors. Banks, insurance companies, "guaranteed" mortgage houses—our most "respectable" and "conservative" financiers—all took part in picking the public's pockets in those grand-extravaganza days when the pickings were good.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cuba and the New Deal

THE rapid march of events in Cuba records the resignation of President Ramon Grau San Martin, the forty-eight-hour presidency of a member of his Cabinet, Carlos Hevia, and the selection as interim President of Colonel Carlos Mendieta. By the time these words reach the majority of *Nation* readers Mendieta will probably have been recognized by the Roosevelt Administration. Sumner Welles succeeded until the end in preventing recognition of Grau San Martin. Despite this non-recognition, which carried with it the non-recognition of nearly all the other nations of the world, served as a constant incitement to every hostile and self-seeking force in Cuba, delayed the much-needed program of reconstruction, and intensified the economic collapse, the Grau regime lasted for nearly four and a half months. It was an extraordinary achievement—an achievement in self-government. It was likewise a demonstration of the strong social-revolutionary sentiment in Cuba which furnished the support for Grau—the Cuban masses were in large measure his following. It furnished conclusive evidence of the fatuousness of the Administration's Cuban policy. It revealed how gravely the wise, larger Latin American policy conceived by President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull and efficiently materialized by the latter at Montevideo may be impaired by a single truculent subordinate.

The Nation maintained from the start that the Roosevelt Administration should have recognized the Grau regime promptly, even as it automatically recognized the Céspedes regime which Ambassador Welles played so important a part in installing. Apart from the specific instance in Cuba, *The Nation* believes that our whole recognition policy in Latin America should be scrapped, and that de facto governments should not be required to win the approval of the United States ambassador or minister at the post, or of some underling in the Latin American division of the State Department. To date, this policy has got us into no end of trouble and created only ill-will. The Mexican policy under the so-called Estrada doctrine, in which recognition automatically takes place after changes of regime, is far more sensible. As matters now stand, the Welles policy in Cuba has created a tremendous amount of anti-American feeling and has naturally inculcated the conviction that our Cuban policy continues to be what it always has been—one of meddling in order to establish the particular type of government which the State Department desires. That is a tragic and unfortunate belief, for the purpose of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull is really much better. To their credit let it be restated that they have refused to send in marines and have pledged themselves before the world not to intervene militarily in Cuba. Unfortunately the destinies of the United States and Cuba are so closely linked that the United States holds the whip hand without military intervention. The fate of Grau San Martin is the concrete evidence thereof. Hevia, who represented a continuation of the Grau San Martin policies, was similarly a victim.

Washington cannot well do other than recognize Mendieta. The situation is already far more complex and far more anarchic, if that is possible, than it was four and a half months ago when Grau San Martin came into office. Mendieta is an old-line politician, not too bright. The best thing that can be said is that he is honest, which means a good deal in the case of a Cuban politician of the old regime. His Cabinet, which includes representatives of the A. B. C., of the Menocalistas (followers of former President Mario Menocal), of the Marianistas (followers of Miguel Mariano Gómez, son of former President Gómez), and several men not particularly associated with any one group, contains some able men. It is, however, essentially the same kind of government as that of Céspedes. It leaves out the students, who have played so important a part in the government for the last four months, and it leaves out the left wings generally—those groups who understand that Cuba requires more than a political change. The A. B. C., whatever may have been its original orientation and the present divergences within its ranks, comes closer to representing a fascist movement today than anything else. Fascism and old-guardism are conspicuous in the new line-up. It has the support of the American colony in Havana, whose real desire, of course, is annexation. It is warmly indorsed by Orestes Ferrara, Machado's Secretary of State, now in exile. One important element distinguishes the support of the Mendieta Government from that of Céspedes. The Mendieta Government has at this moment the pledged support of Colonel Fulgencio Batista—who indeed was the implement with which Grau and Hevia were successively deposed and Mendieta established. When, as a sergeant, Batista led the revolt of the rank and file of the Machado army against its officers and joined with the students to overthrow the Céspedes Government, one of the most potent arguments, especially directed at liberal opinion in the United States, emanating from our embassy at Havana, was that the United States could not well recognize a government largely supported by the military. Now the fact that Mendieta has the support of this same Batista is cited in justification of his recognition. To contrast the insurmountable tests and standards we presented to President Grau and the ready recognition we accord to Colonel Mendieta is to disclose the inconsistency, the absurdity, and the personal bias which have characterized our Cuban policy. The only way in which those past errors can be rectified and a New Deal really brought to Cuba is to proceed henceforth with a frank, vigorous, and generous policy which will include prompt announcement of:

1. Our abandonment of the Platt Amendment without reservations.

2. Negotiation of a new reciprocal agreement which will give Cuba a certain preferential arrangement in the matter of sugar quotas and duties. (This arrangement, while benefiting Cuba, will also permit its restoration as an American market and need not be set down as pure altruism.)

3. Active and disinterested cooperation of the United States with the Cuban government in relieving distress and in bringing about economic reconstruction.

It is fortunate that Secretary Hull is back to take personal charge of affairs. *The Nation* wishes here to record its unqualified praise for the masterful way in which he con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ducted himself at Montevideo. He achieved there far more than even the most optimistic had a right to expect. The Administration had greatly handicapped him with its Cuban and Haitian policies and its original prohibition of the discussion of economic matters. At the opening of the conference, in an atmosphere of skepticism, defeatism, and distrust of the United States—the cumulative legacy of our past Latin American policy—Secretary Hull's task looked nearly hopeless. That he succeeded in reversing this attitude, that he instilled for the first time a genuine trust and confidence in the purposes of the United States, that he substituted good-will for hostility, was no slight achievement. But it should not be forgotten that the Latin Americans took at their full value what were really pledges for the future, such as Secretary Hull's plea that the Administration be judged by its acts rather than its utterances. For that reason the Cuban policy henceforth will be of the greatest importance. It will be regarded as one of the acid tests of our sincerity. It will have to be a policy totally different in spirit and attitude from the personal, intriguing, manipulating, and domineering policy of recent years and, unfortunately, also of recent months.

A Tariff Revolution?

AN extraordinarily far-reaching and revolutionary plan of dealing with the industries of the United States in relation to our tariffs and foreign trade has been prepared for the President. It emanates from a group of advisers termed the Executive Commercial Policy Committee. The chairman of this committee, Francis B. Sayre, declares that the outline of the plan already published in numerous newspapers is not the final document and that a number of changes have been made in it. None the less, certain phases of the memorandum are in accord with the tariff policy of the President so far as it has emerged from darkness at Montevideo and elsewhere. Primarily, the object is to give the President almost complete power over the tariffs, even to the extent of permitting him to declare that certain industries do not need and shall not have protection. The purpose is twofold: to place the tariffs in the hands of the President as a weapon with which to obtain trade bargains, concessions, and agreements from foreign countries, and to insure a long-term commercial policy. The memorandum points out that such a policy was urged by the Secretary of Agriculture in his speech of November 14. Mr. Wallace declared at that time that the country is now compelled to choose whether it will sanction retention of our present foreign markets and their increase, or abandon foreign trade altogether, or discover some possible middle course. In other words, what is at hand is an attempt to make the country face its commercial future, decide what course it will pursue, and then adjust not only our foreign relations and foreign trade to this policy, but also relate to it the necessary domestic readjustments. Secretary Wallace declared that this might mean the withdrawal from agricultural purposes of no less than 50,000,000 acres of land and the assignment of the population to other industries.

Primarily, the plan as thus far outlined requires the classification of all the industries of the United States into six grades, in accordance with their economic suitability to the country, their value for national defense, their general social utility, the number of their employees and the amount of capital involved, their geographical distribution, the alternative sources of foreign goods for the goods they create, and finally "the mutual dependence, for proper operation, of each industry on others." In Grade A would be placed industries the products of which normally are largely exported. In Grade B would be put industries which on the whole have shown the power to sustain themselves against foreign competition without much assistance, employ large numbers, and turn out satisfactory products at reasonable prices. In Grade C would come industries important primarily in relation to national defense. In Grade D would appear industries that have not shown themselves as well suited to our economic environment as those in A and B. In Grade E would be placed industries which "are, on the whole, a burden because they possess so weak an economic basis or because they have exhausted their basis," and with them would be ranked certain luxury trades now so highly protected as to lead to the total exclusion of foreign competition. Finally, in Grade F would be put commodities for the production of which the country is totally unsuited, such as bananas, coffee, tea, and rubber. It is explained that care must be taken to make it clear that "no immediate tariff adjustment is in contemplation," which does not seem to comport with Mr. Hull's pronouncement at Montevideo. Each of the grades is, of course, to be studied as to the tariffs it needs and the conditions under which it is to be conducted.

Obviously this plan involves a radical break with the past. If the principles outlined above are adopted by the President and by Congress, there will be placed in the President's hands a tremendous power over American industry. It will be possible for him to pass the death sentence upon weak and struggling enterprises and to regulate the profits of those remaining, precisely as in the past Congress has made the government a partner in all protected enterprises and undertaken to insure their profits. The arguments for this change are plain. It would put an end to the sale of tariff favors by political parties in return for campaign contributions. It would end the terrific pressure upon Congress by vested interests and local considerations. It would doubtless put an end to a considerable amount of corruption, but on the other hand, it would transfer to the President and to the Tariff Commission that pressure from which Congress has suffered. This may, however, be more or less eliminated if the country can establish a given and unchangeable policy for a number of years. Whether that can be done in view of the ever-changing economic conditions of the world, and within the United States itself, is open to question. The tariff has always been in politics and it will be difficult to remove it for long. At least it is gratifying to record that the old emotional tariff slogans are not to be found in this memorandum. We hear nothing about the full dinner pail or competition by pauper labor or the maintenance of the "high standard" of American living. It contains a concrete proposal to deal with the tariffs, as long as we still continue them, in a generally scientific way in accord with national economic planning.

Whether Congress will assent to yield its power over tariffs remains to be seen. Of course the Executive has had the power to make changes in the tariffs on the recommendation of the Tariff Commission established by President Wilson

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in 1917. But in practice the commission has disappointed its friends and justified its critics in that it has been little else than a tool of the protected industries and not a safeguard against extortionate prices. It is only just to add, however, that the chief reason for its innocuous desuetude lies in the course pursued by the three Republican Presidents who succeeded Mr. Wilson rather than in any special weakness in the commission theory. But with conditions of tariff-making as they have been and with the sale of tariff favors the established custom of the Republican Party, no other outcome was possible. The Commercial Policy Committee believes that the enormous amount of knowledge and statistics acquired by the Tariff Commission during all these years will be of great value in the stupendous task of cataloguing and grading all the industries of this vast country. While we cannot yield our belief that the world would profit enormously by heavy lateral tariff reductions or far-reaching reciprocity agreements, we cannot withhold our gratitude that this study, whether one approves of its details or not, bears the earmarks of an earnest effort to mitigate what has been in many respects the outstanding folly and scandal of our economic life.

When Mothers Die It's News

WHEN more than 300 newspapers in thirty-nine States of the Union pick up a story sent out from New York City, it is safe to say that it is a matter of acute and outstanding public interest. This was the surprising response to the recent report of the New York Academy of Medicine on the question of maternal mortality. It will be remembered that the report studied 2,000 maternal deaths in New York City over a period of two years, and found two-thirds of them to have been preventable. The sequel to these figures was brought out in the discussion, on January 18, sponsored by the New York Maternity Center Association, in which the question was, in effect: Here is this report. What shall we do about it?

Representatives of the medical, nursing, and public-health fields presented their ideas of the best way of dealing with what is a crucial problem in American vital statistics. It was to be expected that the list of remedies would be long and varied. They ranged from reform in the medical schools—where, except in the few first-class institutions in the country, there is no provision for special training in obstetrics—to the education of women in the dangers of easier and shorter labor in childbirth. More and better midwives was the suggestion offered by Mary Beard, associate director of the Rockefeller Foundation; better control of hospitals was the plan offered by Thomas S. McLane, president of the Children's Welfare Foundation. Mr. McLane, incidentally, made the astonishing statement that of 110 proprietary hospitals in New York City, controlled at present only by means of the license issued them by the Department of Hospitals, only three met the standards imposed by the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Several speakers were in favor of a certified list not only of hospitals qualified to give obstetrical service but of physicians qualified to perform it. It was the general feeling that the public must be educated in the knowledge of what constitutes proper maternal care, both prenatal and at delivery, and must then be enabled to find out where such care is available.

Although the maternal-mortality report received such widespread attention from all parts of the country, it must be remembered that New York City presents a situation peculiar to itself. Probably the best care in the country is available there, and it is a tribute to the vitality of American women that the maternal-mortality figures for the country at large are less than 1 per cent higher than they are in New York City. It is evident that in a small rural community, for example, where the only available doctor is a general practitioner who is overworked, underpaid, and perhaps not too thoroughly trained in the first place, the problems of adequate medical care and possible education of the community are much more acute than in a metropolitan area with first-class hospitals and innumerable opportunities for education in public health. If the matter be viewed as a national problem, therefore, it is evident that, although there is a definite responsibility devolving on public-health agencies to obtain nation-wide publicity, the responsibility is equally heavy on the medical profession to insist that adequate training in obstetrics is given to medical students before graduation and that after graduation some method of examination and certification be devised to insure that no physician engages in the practice of obstetrics without the necessary skill for simple cases and the knowledge of his own limitations, so that he may consult more experienced physicians when emergencies arise.

It is one of the curiosities of modern medicine that such reforms, which would seem axiomatic on their face, should be necessary. No general practitioner would attempt to perform an operation on the brain of one of his patients; he would turn the case over to a specialist. But in obstetrics an inexperienced operator will not hesitate to perform a Caesarean section, and more than that, will presume to decide when and if it should be performed.

It must not be forgotten, however, that one of the gravest difficulties in the way of providing and obtaining adequate medical care in childbirth is an economic one. The doctor claims that he is not adequately paid for his obstetrical work; he knows that he should spend a number of hours in prenatal examination and analysis; he knows that he must be prepared to give more hours of attention during labor and for post-partum care. It is estimated that the average obstetrical case requires thirty hours of the doctor's time, and for that he is paid an average fee of not more than $50—probably less than that. Moreover, for medical schools to institute special courses in obstetrical work will take money. To provide adequate hospitalization takes money also. Dr. Louis I. Dublin declared at the Maternity Center meeting that the public should be prepared to pay for better care than it is now getting, either through taxation to provide funds for city hospitals or directly in the form of larger medical fees. The public, of course, is convinced that it pays at present every cent it can afford, and more, for medical care. The answer points directly to some form of socialized medicine. But before we get it, we may continue to wonder at the strange state of mind which has persisted in considering childbirth not as a bodily crisis requiring expert diagnosis, prognosis, and therapy, but as a natural function which more or less takes care of itself.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Issues and Men

The President's Disarmament Opportunity

THE President has won deserved applause for his return to the question of peace and disarmament in his address at the Woodrow Wilson dinner of December 28. He then made the daring and wise proposal that the nations insure peace by pledging themselves to abolish offensive armaments and never to cross the boundaries of their neighbor states. If this program were followed, the whole aspect of the world would change. It would certainly be a test of the sincerity of the tiresome assertions by statesmen everywhere that they seek only the defense of their countries. If you listen to them, you can only wonder how it is that any wars ever take place. On the other hand, the military men employed by these gentlemen are always saying that the truest defense is a quick and overwhelming offense—a theory that Theodore Roosevelt was always harping upon. If President Roosevelt should ask the nations of the world to meet in convention and reinforce the Kellogg-Briand Pact by pledging themselves to his two latest proposals, we should certainly be able to find out whether the countries that are so certain—like our own—that they never, never are aggressors in international strife are genuine in their professions or not.

Now when the President made that speech he was perfectly aware that the Disarmament Conference at Geneva has had before it the major aspects of the proposal to discard offensive weapons which he mentioned. For in Geneva the effort has been to outlaw all bombing planes, poisonous gases, heavy artillery, and tanks. Plainly Geneva offers the opportunity to achieve one of the President's objectives. But, it may be said, the Geneva conference is dead, Germany has withdrawn from it, so why waste any more time upon it? The answer is that the Disarmament Conference is not dead, and that the withdrawal of Germany, largely due to internal political considerations, may as a matter of fact make it easier to negotiate with that country than if its delegates were at Geneva working in the open and closely watched by the excited public sentiment at home which Hitler has created and which, some people think, is now beginning to be a little worrisome and out of hand. Certainly there is every evidence that negotiations are still going on. The press reports direct communication between France and Germany. Whether the next step is achieved by direct negotiations or through the conference, the simple fact is that something has got to be done about the German demands and the general question of disarmament unless Europe is to drift aimlessly while Germany proceeds to arm in defiance of the Allies and the Treaty of Versailles. It may be an impasse at the moment, but the way out has got to be found unless everybody is to sit down and resign himself to the coming of the next war.

Here lies the President's great opportunity. Now would be the psychological moment for him to come to the front with a definite proposal for the solution of the Franco-German problem of the moment and with definite concrete suggestions concerning what the United States is willing to do. I am well aware that the Disarmament Conference is dealing with land armaments, but I would have the President bring in naval armaments as well without waiting for the next naval conference, now scheduled for 1935. I would have him take a leaf out of Secretary Hughes's book and electrify Geneva, as Mr. Hughes electrified the Washington Conference for the Limitation of Armaments by the practicality of his proposals. I would have him announce that he was recommending to Congress immediately the decrease by one-third of the United States army and the mustering out of 50 per cent of our reserve officers as evidence of our good faith, and that he was willing to stop the building of new ships and to accept the Hoover proposal for decreasing existing naval forces by one-third upon a similar agreement to act by England, Japan, France, and Italy, provided, furthermore, that France and Germany accepted a compromise proposal offered by the President to end the existing deadlock between those two countries.

It would be an enormous advantage if the initiative came from the United States, for that would save the face of the French and make it much less possible for Hitler to convince his people that the result was brought about by his aggressive stand against the Allies and his withdrawal from the Disarmament Conference, by which he frightened the French into a compromise arrangement concerning German rearmament. As for the exact form of the proposal, that would not be difficult to arrive at. I believe that the President and Norman Davis could very quickly work it out. My reason for this is that the Germans and French have twice been on the *very verge of agreement,* once just before the Tardieu Government fell and spoiled things, and again when the Germans withdrew from the conference. If they were so near to a satisfactory working plan then, they could hardly decline to accept one now, unless Hitler is determined to bring upon his country the hostility of all other nations.

While no one else is in such a strategic position to do this as the United States, it should be our policy first to ask Great Britain to join with us in this offer to Germany and France. But if for one reason or another England refused, we could and should go it alone. I believe that this offers a certain way, perhaps the only immediate way, out of the deadlock. Such a move, even if it were only partially successful as far as disarmament is concerned, would give a marvelous uplift to all Europe. Indeed, it would change its whole psychology, which is now rapidly drifting toward a state of mind which makes everybody speculate how soon another conflict will come. It would be a vital contribution toward economic recovery, for it would restore confidence in a sane future, and without confidence there can be no progress toward a genuine rehabilitation of Europe and our own country.

Oswald Garrison Villard

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Luxury in the U. S. S. R.

By LOUIS FISCHER

Moscow, January 3

IN Germany "the use of machinery has been forbidden in certain trades," writes a highly recommended contributor to the *New Statesman and Nation*. Mussolini enacted a law in January, 1933, whereby "the erection of new, or the extension of existing, plants may only be undertaken with the sanction of the government." The Roosevelt Administration, says the New York correspondent of the London *Times*, "intends to see that no increase in productive machinery of the great corporations shall be made without its specific approval." This is the reply to Professor T. E. Gregory ("Gold, Unemployment, and Capitalism") and to other apologists of the capitalist system who ask whether a planned economy does not retard progress. Yes, it does—under capitalism. The bourgeoisie submits to government direction when it needs government subsidies, and that is in time of crisis. A crisis registers the expansion of plant beyond the capacity of the population to absorb the plant's products. The government therefore uses the power its subsidies give it to check capitalism's natural instincts toward expansion. The more far-reaching the government's "plan," the more complete is the resulting stoppage of industrial advance.

One of the chief objections of industrialists to inflation is that it induces factory construction. Inflation may serve as a temporary and illusory stimulation of economic activity; by enlarging industrial capacity, however, it prepares the ground for another slump. Since a depression registers the failure of consumption to keep pace with production, there are two cures for a depression: increase consumption or reduce production. Planning under capitalism is conceived first of all as a means of reducing the productive capacity of the nation.

Soviet planning does the very opposite. The primary purpose of the first Five-Year Plan (1929-32) was to build new cities, industries, factories, hydroelectric power stations, railroads—in a word, to expand the U. S. S. R.'s productive capacity. At a tremendous cost of money, health, nerves, and life, it has achieved that purpose.

More than 1,500 Soviet factories were built during the four years and three months of the first Five-Year Plan period. In the same period the Bolsheviks constructed thirty-three "giant" blast furnaces and sixty-three open-hearth furnaces. The production of electric energy rose from 5,003,000 kilowatt-hours at the start of the first Piatiletka to 13,100,000 kilowatt-hours on January 1, 1933, when it ended. The Soviet coal industry was using 60 pneumatic pick-hammers on October 1, 1928, and 5,220 on January 1, 1933. About 1,000,000 spindles were introduced into the Soviet textile industry between 1928 and 1933. Of the 2,700 sawmill frames working in the U. S. S. R. in 1933, 1,000 were erected during the period of the plan, doubling the output capacity of the industry. The area under grain cultivation was increased during the first Piatiletka by 7,500,000 hectares, and that under technical crops—cotton, flax, and so forth—by the same amount. These figures, the Bolsheviks like to say, are the "music of socialism." Similar performances could be cited in literally every branch of Soviet industry.

Not only have old Russian industries been expanded; wholly new industries have been created. No automobiles or tractors were produced in Russia before the revolution. But in the first nine months of 1933 three new automobile plants manufactured 35,327 passenger cars and trucks, and three factories built since 1928 turned out 54,624 tractors. A whole new chemical industry has sprung up. New mineral and metal deposits have been discovered and placed under exploitation. Between 1914 and 1933 the urban population of Russia rose from 25,000,000 to 39,000,000, an increase that includes towns which simply did not exist a few years ago even as tiny settlements but which are now booming industrial centers. Soviet planning, obviously, does not retard progress. It stimulates progress. The progress indicated above is continuing at a rapid pace under the second Five-Year Plan.

A planned society, says Professor Gregory—and with him many others—"is one based on the principle of force." This is the anti-planners' second argument. It is a naive argument. All governments are based on force. The question is only of the degree of force, who administers it, and for what purpose. Donald R. Richberg, chief counsel of the American NRA, in discussing this problem recently before the Cleveland Bar Association, said quite correctly: "Practices which definitely destroy the economic security of great masses of people are clearly destructive of their liberty."

For what benefits it a man if he retains the ballot but has no job and no bread? Does freedom include the right to be unemployed and to be sent into the trenches? Force which eliminates oppressors and exploiters, creates work and prosperity, and guarantees progress and economic security will not be resented by the great masses of people. With the growing interference of the state in industry, the liberties of individuals are being circumscribed in every country in the world. The United States government is even insisting on the reduction of salaries in private business corporations. Tariffs, taxes, and laws are forms of force. Control of currency is a most powerful weapon in the hands of the state. No one can properly object to planning because it is based on the principle of force. The real issue is: Force, to what end?

Must the force and centralization which make planning possible eliminate the consumer's free choice? The assertion that it must is often encountered in the literature of the anti-planners. They contend that the government's compulsive weapons would be used to standardize life; that citizens would have to eat, drink, dress, and live as the authorities wished them to. Here the experience of the Soviet Union is instructive.

In the first three years after the Bolshevik Revolution the government was faced with the trying task of repelling the armed invader, and no attention could be paid to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consumer's tastes. Between 1921 and about 1927 the New Economic Policy gave appreciable freedom to private capitalists who produced for a market and attempted to meet individual wishes. But in the production of most commodities the role of the government was paramount. After 1929 it became practically monopolistic. During all those years the goods famine was grievous. During the first Five-Year Plan it became extremely painful: people were ready to buy anything no matter what the quality. And since most citizens could not buy what they wanted, many Russians, especially young Communists and pro-Soviet intellectuals, affected an indifference to worldly needs and "superficialities" by arguing that fine clothes, for instance, were bourgeois. Girls wore ugly men's caps when nothing prettier was available, and to comfort themselves decided that caps were "Bolshevik." All this sprang in part from prerevolutionary traditions. Hatred of the bourgeoisie inspired hatred of everything that pertained to the bourgeoisie. Simple clothes, simple living were protests against the finery and pleasures of the wealthy. Simple living, moreover, conduced to concentration on revolutionary activities. Self was submerged in the struggle for the liberation of the class. Sparta was trump.

During all those hard years, however, the state endeavored to beautify life. The opera, the ballet, and many theaters displayed a dazzling richness of scene and costume incomparably greater than elsewhere in the world. Parks of culture and rest were established throughout the country to provide sensible recreation and civilized leisure. Around new factories were refreshing flower beds, to which workers always pointed with pride. Palms and rubber plants were the inevitable decorations of public communal kitchens equipped with the most modern imported machinery. Sports and games played in new, magnificent stadiums afforded recreation for millions. But individuals, though thankful for these favors, thirsted for more intimate beauty. The social amenities first made available to them by the Soviet government merely whetted their appetites for more color, light, and softness in their personal life.

The NEP was dead, and the despised, detested Nepmen, or parvenu capitalists, disappeared in 1927-28. A generation appeared that had not known capitalism and that had been too far removed socially from NEP capitalists to be infected by them. Capitalism had become too unreal to warrant a protest against it in the shape of Spartanism. People wanted pleasure for its own sake. Comforts and luxuries were hard to get during the five years of sacrifice between 1928 and 1933. But for that very reason men and women sought and yearned for them all the more. Toward the end of the first Five-Year Plan one could discern a tremendous popular striving for relaxation and brightness. When a theater director showed on the stage how the decadent bourgeoisie of the West was "rotting" in fox-trot cafes, people went because they liked to hear fox trots and to see well-dressed women. A foreign fashion magazine was a prize and still is. What would a woman not give for a French beret! Those who could manage it got gramophones and records from abroad. From the polkas and folk dances of the park of culture and rest to the weekly "five-o'clock tea and dance" at the Metropole or National Hotel is but one short step. In the beginning jazz was underground—in the homes of the influential. But soon it burst into its officially recognized own. Visiting radicals are sometimes shocked by the confetti, toy balloons, tightly packed public dance floors, and jazz orchestras. We associate these things with Western social phenomena which are disgusting. But is there anything inherently objectionable in them?

Women like to dress well, and men like women to dress well, as Soviet women who neglected this biological truism have now discovered to their hurt. Even during the worst years of the goods' shortage, patent-leather shoes and silk stockings appeared in far-off villages. A good Russian dressmaker can today get any price for her services. An article in the *Pravda* recently praised a concert singer who appeared at a workers' club in a silk dress and elegant shoes. Clothing factories have been organizing popular fashion shows, and only those dresses, underwear, and suits selected by the public as best may be manufactured by the factories and shops. The government has ordered the textile industry to turn out thinner satins and finer silks. Even cotton goods must be of better grade. "Peasant women refuse to wear coarse prints," says a Moscow daily. *Izvestia* objects to "ugly, untalented designs which do not satisfy the aesthetic tastes of the consumer." The women of a North Caucasus kolhoz recently wrote an open letter to Stalin. They demanded goods that "would make the soul rejoice."

About two years ago, in the darkest days of the first Five-Year Plan, the Academia Publishing Company began to issue a great many exquisite editions of the classics: "The Arabian Nights," Dante, Homer, "Don Quixote," "Gulliver's Travels," and so on. These books are very expensive but worthy of the most fastidious collecter's taste, and thousands of Soviet citizens now frantically scour the bookstores for them. Most of the volumes are sold within the country on advance subscriptions.

A worker in a new ball-bearing factory in Moscow is quoted approvingly by the *Pravda*. He wants all his furniture to be oaken and executed in one style, he said at a conference on proletarian living conditions. Another worker said: "I have learned to love music, and attend the opera with especial joy. I like 'Carmen' most." "Carmen" was the general favorite of the meeting.

Far from regimenting life and eliminating the consumer's choice, the Bolsheviks, now that the volume of goods and the availability of cultural institutions make it possible, are encouraging the widest range of individual appetites. In a recent *Pravda* article significantly entitled The Return of Venus, dealing with the beautification and enrichment of Soviet life, Valeria Gerasimova says: "The struggle for human individuality, the struggle for the all-sided, free, and powerful development of all of that individuality's abilities, talents, and potentialities, the struggle for the true dignity and real beauty of man—that is the struggle which irresistibly attracts the builders of socialism." The Bolsheviks always believed in individualism provided it did not benefit a few and damage the community as a whole. They always favored freedom provided it did not mean the freedom for the few to become rich and powerful at the expense of the many. If there was any standardization of living conditions in the Soviet Union it was the standardization of poverty which the poor of all lands know so well. But as soon as the hard-earned dividends of the first plan appeared earlier this year in the shape of more and better commodities, the tendency was all away from sameness and from superficial

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grayness. Every observer in Moscow notes the marked improvement in the general aspect of the city, in the clothes of the people, and in the displays in store windows. Shops sell wares that Russians never knew, wares of striking excellence and taste. Good quality is good business. The better the shoes, coats, blankets which the government produces, the more the national economy gains.

But a nation can live without electric irons, electric kettles, beautiful satins, high-heeled slippers, fancy fur coats, gramophones, musical instruments, pianos, modern bathroom fixtures, silk stockings, and the hundred and one other articles that are being introduced into the Soviet market. If planning eliminates the consumer's free choice, why does not Soviet planning eliminate these dispensable commodities? The answer is of course that the Bolsheviks want the population of the Soviet Union to enjoy a maximum of comforts and luxuries. But this is subjective. The compelling reason is that the success of socialist economy is predicated on an uninterrupted expansion of industrial plant. And production will increase faster if the individual producer's incentive is stimulated by the knowledge that he can spend all he earns on desirable and attractive goods. "Socialist competition," shock brigades, and other devices whereby the government sought to raise output by appealing to social ideals represent the passing phase when goods were scarce. The call to conscience remains, but the chief emphasis now is on concrete compensation in the form of consumers' commodities. The greater the variety and the better the quality of goods, the harder men and women will work. Some people will steal. If Soviet economics were to check the consumer's free choice, Soviet economy would stagnate. All this conforms with the principle that the Bolsheviks do not object to personal initiative or to personal wealth. They object to the conversion of personal wealth into private capital, because they are convinced that socialism guarantees progress and individual well-being more effectively than does private capitalism.

The Dollar: A Political Toy

By HENRY HAZLITT

NEARLY two years ago the present writer published two articles in *The Nation* (issues of March 30 and April 6, 1932) advocating the devaluation of the dollar as a desperate step to meet a desperate emergency. The amount of devaluation suggested was approximately one-third. At that time such a step was nowhere being seriously discussed, and the proposal seemed even to myself to be academic and remote from possible political adoption. Moreover, even apart from this, I felt at the time certain misgivings about the advocacy of such a measure. For to arouse interest in any form of currency change in a time of depression is only too easy, as all our history shows; and it seemed to me that once public attention was turned in this direction, more necessary readjustments, which came closer to removing the causes of the depression, would be slighted. Two measures which seemed to me fundamental, and without the incidental dangers of devaluation, were the scaling down of tariffs and a friendly and realistic readjustment of the war debts. "These two measures," I wrote, "should in any case be taken *first*. If in themselves they should bring about sufficient revival, devaluation could be avoided; and if devaluation were resorted to without them, it might prove in the end abortive, for after the initial recovery" the lack of more fundamental readjustments "could only bring another period of strangulation."

This consideration was not the only one which prevented me from pressing the idea of devaluation with vigor. There was also the practical consideration that though an intelligent and "scientific" devaluation was theoretically possible, it would be utopian to expect such a devaluation from practical politicians; for practical politicians, given even the greatest sincerity and good intentions, have never understood money, and if they are told that they can tinker with it in one way they will proceed to tinker with it in twenty. Writing on the subject nearly a year later, in *Common Sense* of February 16, 1933, while the Hoover Administration was still upon us, I pointed to the fact that in neither Great Britain nor Japan had there been any rise of internal prices at all proportionate to the depreciation of the currencies:

> These disappointing price adjustments [I wrote] are the result of several factors. Chief among them, I believe, is that no definite new gold value has yet been fixed for either currency. It has therefore become the football of speculation, fluctuating from day to day, creating a general atmosphere of uncertainty, and tending still further to choke the currents of foreign trade. Unfortunately, if we have inflation at all in this country, this is the kind we are overwhelmingly likely to get—inflation by default, the inflation of drift, inflation without plan or understanding.

I apologize for these lengthy self-quotations, but I make them because they establish something more substantial than the hollow satisfaction of having been right. They help to answer those who maintain that devaluation does not raise prices, and who, in supposed confirmation of this, point out triumphantly that while the dollar has now depreciated 40 per cent since last February, the general price level has risen only 20 per cent in that time. These quotations indicate that at least a few of the advocates of devaluation have always recognized the difference between devaluation and mere depreciation, between certainty and uncertainty, between being on a gold basis and being off it, and that such advocates never expected depreciation and uncertainty to bring the results they expected from devaluation and certainty.

In the nine months since we abandoned the gold basis, the demoralizing effects of currency uncertainty have become obvious to an increasingly wide circle of observers. When President Roosevelt announced his new gold policy on January 15, therefore, many of these persons hailed it with satisfaction, chiefly on the ground that it put an end to this uncertainty. I cannot myself take this optimistic view. For though the President's new statement removes some uncertainties, it leaves many others; and some of the certainties it does give us are hardly reassuring. Let us consider a few of its implications in turn:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1. The seizure of all the gold in the Federal Reserve banks. No one questions that the government, representing as it does the people as a whole, is entitled to all the windfall *profits* of devaluation. The soundest course would have been for the government to take these, and use them to pay off its excessive debt to the reserve system. Instead of seizing merely the profits, the government is seizing all the gold, the physical gold itself, and planning to pay off nothing to the reserve banks. Wholly apart from the question of constitutionality, this is a dangerous act. From a monetary standpoint, it is worse than unnecessary. It will tend to hurt confidence further rather than to restore it. It puts the gold supply in political hands, and increases and indefinitely prolongs the temptation to play with it and tinker with it. At the World Bank it is pointed out that the world-wide trend of sentiment among monetary experts has been toward freeing monetary systems and central banks from political control; in no important country except Russia does the government still own the gold reserve.

2. There appears to have been an abandonment on the part of the President of at least the commodity-dollar idea, but this abandonment is by no means clear cut. However desirable the commodity dollar may be as an ideal, it is a practical impossibility because (a) if adopted by the United States acting alone it would perpetuate fluctuations in exchange rates, so continuing to demoralize foreign trade, and (b) even if adopted in world collaboration it would allow international speculators to trade with impunity against the government and lead to constant and disastrous raids on the gold supply. What the President seems to have in mind now is a sort of half-hearted compromise between a commodity dollar and a flat devaluation. This hybrid plan merely lacks the theoretical charm of the first and the practical advantages of the second. It continues the present uncertainty with regard to the value of the dollar, at least within a 20 per cent range, and it continues the uncertainty regarding the ultimate date of gold convertibility.

3. If a flat devaluation is ultimately made, the proposed rate is dangerously low. Such conservative authorities on money as Professor E. W. Kemmerer and B. M. Anderson, Jr., who now reluctantly accept devaluation, believe that we should devaluate at approximately 65 per cent of the old parity rather than at 60 or 50 per cent; and though both regard even this figure as a political rather than an economic necessity, I incline to believe, on economic grounds, that the figure is about right. Professor Kemmerer points out that, even if we assume no tendency for prices to rise in any case as a result of the return of normal confidence and as a result of the decreased world demand for gold brought about by devaluation, a 60-cent gold dollar would ultimately mean a general price level 56 per cent higher than now and 21 per cent higher even than it was in the so-called "normal" year 1926; while a 50-cent dollar would mean a general price level ultimately 86 per cent higher than now and about 45 per cent higher than in 1926. It need not be pointed out how adverse the effect of this would be on labor, in view of the historic tendency of wage advances to lag behind price advances. For purely monetary reasons, it is true, it is better to have a devaluation that is somewhat too great rather than one that is somewhat too small, to reduce the danger of ever needing a second devaluation, but even when this is allowed for, as well as the strong political pressure of the farming elements, 40 per cent ought to be regarded as the maximum devaluation rather than as the minimum.

4. The President in his January 15 message incidentally remarked: "The practice of transferring gold from one individual to another or from the government to an individual within a nation is not only unnecessary but is in every way undesirable. The transfer of gold in bulk is essential only for the payment of international trade balances." This belief is erroneous, and ought to be abandoned. Such a policy would permit foreigners, but not Americans, to protect themselves in times of monetary danger. It would mean that foreign speculators could pull out our gold, but not American speculators. In actual practice, it would not even protect the American gold supply. Americans who feared the stability of the currency, or who wanted to hoard, would simply act through foreign agents. As a matter of fact, continuous and free convertibility, both at home and abroad, acts in the long run as a protection rather than a danger to a currency. The loss of gold is a danger signal against credit and other monetary excesses, and in all but periods of the most violent upheaval leads to a curbing of such excesses in time rather than to an abandonment of the gold basis.

5. "Because of world uncertainties, I do not believe it desirable in the public interest that an exact value for the dollar be now fixed." This is not only President Roosevelt's policy; it is the policy of Great Britain and of every other nation now on a paper basis. The fundamental fallacy of that policy is that it creates and prolongs the very uncertainties that it fears. It is true that no one can tell *precisely* how any given percentage of devaluation will affect the general price level. The forces at work are too complex, and they are elusive because they are basically psychological. But in so far as this uncertainty exists, it will be just as great a year or two years or three years from now as it is today. A level can be fixed only in accordance with probabilities and reasonable suppositions. One can merely say that, other things being equal, the price level will vary inversely as the gold content of the monetary unit in terms of which prices are fixed.

6. The $2,000,000,000 stabilization fund, though it follows the example of Great Britain, is at bottom unnecessary. The common assumption that de facto stabilization must precede de jure stabilization is completely mistaken. The simple truth is that de jure stabilization is easier, less cumbersome, and less expensive than an attempt at de facto stabilization without it.

In sum, the way to stabilize is to stabilize. The way to devaluate is to devaluate. It would give a tremendous lift to world confidence if Great Britain and the United States agreed to return to gold convertibility at the same time, each fixing its own rate, incidentally attempting, merely for convenience of calculation, to have the two currencies bear round relationships to each other instead of the former cumbersome $4.86656. We should not worry about trying to under-devaluate the British for the sake of foreign trade. The real advantages of such competitive under-devaluation would be negligible and temporary at best; most of such alleged advantages are illusory. It would be folly enough to start a "currency war" even if the gains of victory were real; it is insane to contemplate one when the gains even of the victor would be practically non-existent, wholly apart from the certainty of tariff reprisals.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hitler Dissolves the Fascist Unions

By LUDWIG LORE

IN the clamor over the persecution of the German Jew and the expatriation of the German intellectual, elements which comprise less than 5 per cent of the country's population, German labor and the fate of its trade-union organizations have received surprisingly little attention outside of Germany. Yet the National Socialist labor program and its development in the Third Reich are of much greater and much more lasting significance. The dictatorship's attitude toward labor is fundamental to fascism, while the suppression of the Jew and the intellectual is a superficial outgrowth and incidental to Germany's momentary national needs.

To the American who scans his own labor horizon with an interested eye, the influence of this new growth in Italy and Germany on the labor unions in his own country should be a matter of some concern. The mass influx of hitherto unorganized elements into existing unions and the influence that these workers—for the most part unskilled and poorly paid—will exert in the American labor movement will endow its organizations with new potentialities. Furthermore, the emphasis placed by capital on company unionism under the New Deal may well lead to a more sympathetic attitude toward the fascist brand of employer-dominated labor organization.

Dr. Robert Ley, the leader of Germany's National Labor Front, expressed the conflict between class-conscious and acquiescent labor unionism concretely on May 3 of last year, one day after the occupation of all trade-union headquarters, the arrest of all trade-union officials, and their replacement by Nazi functionaries had made the "coordination" of the country's labor organizations an accomplished fact. "When once we have freed the German labor unions from the evil influence of the Marxist class-struggle idea, they will be in a position to defend the interests of German labor more emphatically and more effectively than ever before." Several weeks later, Walter Schuhmann, appointed by Hitler to direct the "coordinated" white-collar workers' unions, proclaimed that "the trade union is the economic representative of the worker in industry and must be preserved intact and independent of the interference of National Socialist shop units."

The fall of the curtain on Germany's independent trade unions was not decided on without serious controversy in the Nazi ranks. Göring, Frick, and others favored the immediate and unequivocal destruction of the trade-union offices, while the Nazi leaders from the great industrial centers for a time insisted or pretended to insist on the retention of the trade unions and their headquarters as bulwarks of fascist labor. Thousands believed what Goebbels had promised in the Berlin street-car strike of September, 1932—that "a new National Socialist leadership would make the employing class feel the weight of its fist, would not, like the Marxists, back down before them." But the May Day that followed Hitler's accession to power showed the National Socialist labor program in a different light.

Official arbitrators (Treuhänder der Arbeit) were appointed and given full and authoritative control over all matters concerning labor and working conditions. That they were recruited chiefly from among corporation lawyers clearly reveals the purpose of their appointment. The trade unions became mere discussion clubs. They lost the right to strike, to make contracts, to function generally as independent bodies. "Only the enemies of our revolution," announced Dr. Ley, "can be interested in stoppages, strikes, lockouts, and similar things. Oppose them wherever they raise their head, be on your guard, work for the unimpeded growth of our industries, for the success, for the victory, for the greatness of our Germany and our people."

What was the caliber of the men who replaced the "Marxist chairwarmers" of the old trade unions? There was Colonel von Gilsa for instance, formerly general director of a steel plant, who now received "honorary appointment" as secretary of the Steel and Iron Workers' Union with full authority over the finances of the organization. The largest trade-union federation, the Metallarbeiter-Verband, with 500,000 members, was placed under the control of three S. A. Nazis—Heinz Lothar Beck, twenty-six years old, Johannes Müller, twenty-eight, and Richard Hasse, thirty-two, none of whom had ever worked in the metal industry or had ever been connected with any other industrial enterprise. Their sole claim to the posts lay in their faithful service in the Nazi ranks.

An order issued last June by the director of the Organization Bureau of the Labor Front will illustrate the brutality with which the new regime wreaked vengeance on deposed trade-union officials:

> The directors of the General Federation of German Workers will submit to me not later than the end of this week a list of all leading Marxists in the trade unions whose names will be included by me on a "List of the Despised." This list, which will probably contain several thousand names, will be sent to all ministries. labor bureaus, employers' organizations, and all other interested persons and organizations directly connected with German industry, to the end that it may become impossible for these elements to secure employment of any kind. No false sentimentality shall prevent the directors of trade unions from submitting the names of these despicable scoundrels. Only those may be omitted who, having held unimportant office, were probably led astray or acted under pressure from their superiors. Heil Hitler! [Signed] MUCHOW.

In his pamphlet "Ministersessel oder Revolution" Otto Strasser, at present a refugee in Prague, leader of the "Schwarze Front," that Nazi secession movement which really believed in the socialist program of the Nazi Party, quotes a telling utterance made by Hitler in the course of a conversation in May, 1930:

> We have an example that we may safely follow—Italian fascism. Just as in that country, our own National Socialist state will find employers and workers side by side with equal privileges and rights, under the direction of a powerful state which will render the final verdict in all differences so that industrial strife no longer menaces the life of the nation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But just as in Italy, events in Germany failed to follow the straight and narrow path of Nazi theory. Mass organizations, especially when they are based on the material interests of their members, develop their own logic and make their own laws. Mussolini, after his march on Rome, retained the trade-union formations and placed them under the direction of tried and trusted Fascist leaders. For a time all went well enough—until in 1928 the trade unions rebelled against Fascist industrial and social policies and put the supremacy of Mussolini to a severe test. Only the ruthlessness of the Duce, who at once removed from their posts Rossini and many others among his most intimate friends, carried the day for fascism in that critical period. National Socialist Germany found itself face to face with a similar situation in its fascized unions. Despite propaganda and terror the old trade-union leaders retained much of their influence over the membership. The superior knowledge and experience of these trained men and women and the confidence they had won in years of work shoulder to shoulder with the rank and file could not be wiped out by a single stroke of the pen. Discussion in union meetings, even when it turned not on political but on practical questions of the workers' livelihood, had a habit of moving in uncomfortably critical directions that sorely taxed the untried abilities of the Nazi directors. Threats and warnings were of no avail and the Nazi leaders were forced to apply more drastic measures. In a meeting of the Leipzig printing trades several typesetters dared to laugh at a particularly stupid and bombastic speech by the Nazi Commissar. They were expelled at once for "conduct unbecoming a member of a trade-union organization." In Essen three members of a section of the Metal Workers' Union were arrested and interned in a concentration camp for scoffing remarks during the course of a meeting. In Breslau a wood worker forgot his duties as a German worker and failed to greet the Nazi official with a "Heil, Hitler!" He was expelled and sent to jail for four months. Such instances could be multiplied a thousand fold. But in spite of these terroristic methods the unions continued to be a fruitful field for Marxist propaganda. An incessant flood of leading questions could so thoroughly disorganize a meeting that its use as a basis for the propagation of fascist ideas and the formation of a new front became nil. For these reasons the unions had to be suppressed lest they undermine the proud structure of National Socialist supremacy. Hitler profited by Mussolini's experience. He did not wait for a crisis, but wiped out the organizations which gave his enemies so many opportunities for anti-fascist agitation.

After the November 12 election with its "demonstration of the German people for Hitler," the government believed that the moment for the destruction of the trade-union remnants had arrived. Trade-union and employer organizations were ordered dissolved—why employers' anti-union associations when the government so whole-heartedly assumes their functions? The Labor Front, in which formerly manual workers, white-collar workers, and employers had been separately organized, was reconstructed. The existing distinctions were wiped out and replaced by a vertical structure in which all persons connected with the industrial life of the nation, from the unskilled worker to the employer, hold individual membership. Withdrawal—that is, the non-payment of dues—is penalized with unemployment, the "person thus withdrawing from membership in the Labor Front losing all claim to state or municipal support." An announcement by Dr. Ley, dated January 14, says:

> Citizens of the Reich who do not yet belong to the German Labor Front are more urgently than ever called upon to join its ranks. Workers, salaried employees, and employers belong together. Having recognized this fundamental need in our new social order—the need of bringing together workers and employers in the country, in our industries, and in our population—we must begin with the Labor Front as a matter of course. We cannot preach what we do not practice.

It is characteristic of Nazi methods that the National Socialist functionaries who had briefly exercised nominal control over the coordinated labor unions were given the status of civil-service employees with full pension rights.

With the dissolution of the trade unions the last hope of the German worker for an organ within the Third Reich through which he might conceivably express his needs and problems disappeared. A proclamation issued late in November and signed by three Cabinet ministers and Dr. Ley outlines the aims and functions of the Labor Front:

> It is the will of our leader Adolf Hitler that the German Labor Front shall not decide on the material problems of the worker's daily existence, nor shall it concern itself with the conflicting interests of individuals in the economic process. For the regulation of conditions of labor, forms will presently be created which will give to the leader and his staff in every plant the position and functions that a National Socialist conception prescribes.
>
> The exalted aim of the Labor Front is the education of all Germans who participate in our industrial life, for the National Socialist state and to a National Socialist conception. It aims particularly to train those best fitted to exert a directive influence in the branches of our social institutions, our labor courts, and our social services. It will strive to make the social honor of the leader of industry (the employer) and that of his following (the employees) a driving force for a new social and economic order.

Yet there was never a time when the German worker needed the protection of a strong labor union more sorely than now. Hitler's fight against unemployment has been a pathetic failure. Franz Seldte, Reich Minister of Labor, in a memorandum issued in the beginning of December "for the exclusive information of official and semi-official organs" of the government provides us with interesting material on the "status of the German labor struggle." According to this document the changes that have taken place in the German labor market are along two lines. For purely financial reasons a large number of persons formerly drawing unemployment benefits have been deprived of this public support under the more stringent regulations introduced by the new regime. This has so reduced the sums paid out that the unemployment-insurance fund showed a surplus of approximately 228,000,000 marks in the period from April to September, 1933.

Deprived of their unemployment benefits, these men and women no longer report at the local labor offices and after a few months are dropped from the lists and disappear from labor statistics. Add to them the tens of thousands of Jews and Marxists permanently removed from Germany's economic life and expelled for the "honor of the fatherland" from the ranks of those entitled to support, and the number of unemployed again appears reduced. The elimination of thou-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sands of women from the labor market, particularly in the commercial fields, and their replacement by unemployed men has further cut down the number of persons officially recognized as "out of work."

But the greatest reduction in figures for the unemployed has been achieved by the simple expedient of turning recipients of unemployed benefits into recipients of public-relief jobs. According to the report of the Minister of Labor the "number of men thus employed is considerable. Official employment figures issued at the end of September, 1933, show 232,000 on public emergency work, 165,000 on reclamation and agricultural work, 64,000 on relief work, 234,000 in the voluntary labor camps—together, in round numbers, 700,000 persons who without the direct assistance of the state would probably have been found on the list of the unemployed."

Compare these figures with those of the pre-Hitler period. In 1932, the year of the greatest depression, 5,102,750 persons registered as unemployed during the month of September. In the same month of 1933, 4,549,222 were officially reported as out of work, representing a reduction of about 550,000 as compared with the previous year. But the figures of the Labor Ministry quoted above prove that this reduction is a sham and a delusion. The 700,000 relief workers, most of whom receive only housing, clothes, and food, and a pittance for their labor, cannot be classed as regularly employed wage workers. List them where they rightly belong, as out of work, and they would more than offset the apparent reduction in the Reich labor report. Moreover, it should not be overlooked that these unpaid men and women, far from representing a healthier economic condition in the Reich, a cranking up of its industrial life, and a faster tempo in the industrial machine, are actually a millstone around its neck, contributing nothing toward an uplift in the home market.

In their misrepresentation of existing conditions, the artful dodgers in the Hitler Government can count on the services of an enslaved press; it would have been difficult, however, to close the eyes of trade unionists to the true state of affairs, still more difficult to enforce their silence. The labor-union movement was the last remaining vestige of social consciousness in the land of the Hitlerites. With its destruction, the new regime relieved itself of all moral responsibility toward the working class.

What Price Tall Buildings?

By OLIVER WHITWELL WILSON

AN elderly lady was examining the drawings of some new buildings that it was proposed to erect in London near her residence. The site could be seen from her window through the trees of the park. Eventually she rejected the plans. The buildings were too tall. "They will spoil my view."

Queen Victoria, in setting this precedent, little realized, perhaps, the significance of her decision; but London has ever since steadily rejected the idea of high buildings. Nine stories, with an occasional exception, are the allowable limit. As a result, London's skyline is very much the same as it was on the day Sir Christopher Wren died. This conservatism of Londoners has often been ridiculed in this country. Yet a small item which appeared recently in the New York press may mean that we shall have to revamp our ideas on tall buildings.

In an inconspicuous paragraph printed amid a maze of announcements issued by the National Recovery Administration, Robert D. Kohn, an architect chosen to assist the government in its recovery program, was quoted as saying that in housing which was to be financed by the National Recovery Administration five stories would be the limit of height for walk-ups and perhaps six stories for elevator apartments, and the average would be three stories. Independently, the New York Regional Plan Association has condemned as unwise any and all rebuilding schemes for the Chrystie-Forsythe site, a property consisting of several narrow strips of land on the lower East Side of Manhattan which were cleared some years ago of disreputable slum tenements. In announcing its decision, the Regional Plan Association stated that proposed developments of this type were not in accord with the best interests of the city. In order to obtain enough income to make housing on that site self-liquidating, the promoters had been considering twelve-story buildings.

It is interesting to recall that many years ago, when New York zoning was first talked of, an advisory committee of which Electus D. Litchfield, an architect, was a prominent member developed the principle of the maximum bulk. This would have limited the total allowable cubic contents of a building on a site to x times the area of that site. X was to be a variable constant depending upon the zone in question. This proviso was kept out of the zoning law by shortsighted speculators who brought pressure to bear upon the city politicians. In its place the existing rule of x times the street width measured from the street center was adopted. This develops a building into a square box with a pyramidal or wedge-shaped top. It is the reason for the present setback style. But it would not have been bad if another joker had not been put in: a tower might be built on 25 per cent of the site. This tower might go up to the moon if it could be so constructed. Thus bulk was allowed to go on forever, irrespective of any considerations of neighborhood, public policy, or economic value. It was hoped that such a tower would pay if it were normally 75 per cent or even 70 per cent occupied. No thought was given to the effect on surrounding property of such concentration of floor area or to the resultant drain of tenants away from that property. It is not surprising, then, for us to read that August Heckscher is suing Rockefeller Center for $10,000,000 for damage done to neighboring property.

New York at that time led the country in an orgy of building skyscrapers. Towers shot up overnight to greater and greater heights. There was the spectacle of one which had its spire constructed inside the building and then had this spike hoisted up to an altitude that beat all others. But

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there are now several which rise to greater heights than that one reached by its ingenious trick. In order to obtain suitable sites for these large developments, many old buildings, even some which had by no means outlasted their usefulness, were razed to make place for new construction. Tenants were forced to move, often at great expense. In certain sections of Manhattan office space for rent increased daily. It was a great bubble while it lasted.

There was another disastrous result. The city fathers found a valid excuse for doubling in ten years the city's assessed valuation. This doubled the city's borrowing power, and the taxpayers are now paying through the nose for a debt which takes over 30 per cent of the city's income in carrying charges, interest payments, and amortization.

Then the bubble burst. Five tall buildings on Forty-second Street not only got into difficulties themselves, but damaged all other values on the street. The largest, the Lincoln Building, had to be sold at public auction three years after its completion. Another building still under construction has been forced to cut its original rental rates in half in order to attract tenants in any quantity; one building in this group has more office space than any other building in the whole city. How this project will ever bring financial profit is a question all are asking. The law of diminishing returns seems rarely to have been taken into account. This point of view was presented to one promoter. He became interested, and studied the particular project that he had in mind from that angle. He found that every story over the forty-fifth became progressively a greater economic drain on the possible profits. It may well be asked whether the advertising value of an eighty-story building can offset this steady financial drain.

The reaction has now set in. The city's tax delinquency is $310,000,000, of which $215,000,000 is deemed collectible. The inflated values that have been set upon property are believed by competent estimators to be 30 per cent too high. From being the soundest of assets mortgages have become a drug in the market, and mortgage money is almost unobtainable.

Perhaps Queen Victoria was a better judge of real-estate policy than the promoters believed at the time. Perhaps she gave expression to a universal sentiment when she objected to her view being shut off by taller buildings. In New York there are few views. The skyscrapers are magnificent when seen from the river. But what an economic folly it is, that many workers should have to use electric light at high noon. The shadow of the tallest building in the world cuts off the sun from many buildings for many hours each day. In summer its influence is felt for many blocks, in winter for a mile or more!

Height has created the same problems in residential regions. Inflated land values brought forth an orgy of apartments which filled all the space that the laws permitted for such structures. These have been well called "superslums." It will not be forgotten how the apartment hotel was used as an excuse to increase the allowable cubage at the ultimate expense of decent living. Many of these buildings are renting at greatly reduced rates, many are almost empty. That even six-story tenements are not desirable is proved by the astounding figures that have been brought to light by the federal censuses. Over 1,000 persons emigrate from Manhattan every week, most of them to lower buildings, light and air, sunshine and green lawns. And there is no longer unlimited immigration to fill the vacancies thus left.

There could not be a more definite proof of the trend of the times than the spectacle of a "taxpayer" on the site of the old Belmont Hotel, which was killed by competition, or of a twelve-story building, quite modern, being replaced by a two-story taxpayer on Madison Avenue in the fashionable Fifty-seventh Street area. Real-estate operators are at their wits' end, taxpayers are defaulting, and buildings are deteriorating through non-occupancy. One hotel overlooking Central Park has actually never removed the dust sheets which still shroud in perpetual gloom several floors of suites. Although there can be little sympathy for those who overpromoted the building boom, such stagnation must be prevented in the future.

There are two necessary steps to take. First, there must be a drastic revision of the zoning sections of the building code. Second, stringent bulk-cubage limitations that were worked out some years ago must be put in force. But in order that these may be effective, consideration will have to be given to existing structures that exceed such limitations. Each block which includes these buildings will have to be averaged in such a way that any new building will not exceed the 100 per cent total allowable for that block. In other words, where tall buildings exist, new buildings in the same block must be low. In this way some of the present evil will be rectified, and as property values are at a low ebb, no one will be hurt by such restrictions. They will permit a general readjustment of property values, and will also tend to protect existing investments in tall buildings against further adjacent destructive competition. Such a limitation will affect not only business buildings, but also tall apartment buildings in which only the ultimate physical development of a particular property has been achieved. Studies by such experts as Henry Wright, Albert Mayer, Eugene Klaber, and Clarence S. Stein seem to prove that from three to four and a half stories is the economical height for residential-group buildings. By keeping housing to this limit, as Robert D. Kohn has proposed, congestion will be kept to a minimum.

The preceding suggestion is a practical solution of the problem, but another point of view will make its advantages still clearer. There is an evident and growing need for proper and adequate public appreciation of city and regional planning. Until this is developed, public opinion will not be strong enough to combat independent shortsighted speculation. Such appreciation will remove the bandages that have blinded the many private investors who lost millions in real estate. So-called mortgage bonds of a prominent chain of large hotels to three times their value, and inflated value at that, could not have been unloaded on a public with an understanding of what planning really is. These investors would have realized that the insertion of "participating" and other such terms took the gold out of these mortgages and turned them into dross. Is it any wonder that most hotels, financed in such a fashion, are in difficulties?

Our City of the Future will not necessarily, then, be a super-Babylonian dream of impossible buildings which crowd human beings together in as small an area as possible. Apart from the potent economic and social objections, tall buildings do "spoil the view" for those of us who have to work and live in their shade.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Power Industry Goes NRA

By JEROME COUNT

CONJECTURE has failed to explain why the power industry did not refuse to submit a "code of fair competition" to a hostile federal Administration. Early in the NRA era this industry declared that it would "stand on the Constitution." Several weeks before the industry actually submitted a code, the Edison Electric Institute bewailed this invasion into the sacred province of State regulation and insisted that a code would mean the irremediable loss of its legal rights. Such a code would be an unwarranted intrusion of federal regulation into intrastate business. It was argued that unfair "competition" could not possibly need regulation in a non-competitive industry.

Nevertheless, after an unexplained change of front and the submission of a code a revealing commentary appeared in the *Public Utility Fortnightly:*

> It now develops that some utilities are cheering for the NRA for projecting itself into the picture just when it seemed as if the whole country were demanding drastic slashes in utility rates. . . . With the federal government openly striving to raise prices of other commodities, the least that the utilities might expect of the Blue Eagle would be some relief from the increased pressure of rate reductions. If that relief is forthcoming, code costs would be a cheap price to pay to get rid of the rate-reduction bugaboo.

It is true that State utility commissions had been showing signs of yielding to public pressure and many rate reductions appeared to be in sight. But hardly had the utilities consented to the blanket code, when a new barrier was thrust between consumers and reduced rates. Increased labor costs under the NRA, according to the utilities, made it impossible to maintain pay rolls and employment and reduce rates at the same time. Many State commissions, just then considering reducing rates, were faced with a new problem. The New York Public Service Commission, for example, allowed $4,000,000 per annum for increased costs under the NRA. However, when public hearings were held upon the proposed permanent code, it came out that increased costs would be no more than nominal.

Minimum wages offered by the industry are below the subsistence level. In opposing the inclusion of public plants under the code, one municipal representative said that "they [the municipal plants] would be ashamed to have their names attached to a code establishing such low wages" as were proposed by the private companies. Wages submitted by the Edison Institute are as low as $9.60 a week and hours run as high as forty-eight a week. According to the institute, it is the public which will not stand for high wages or a shorter week. At all code hearings it is usual for industry to anticipate the demands of labor by a tearful reference to the sad state of balance sheets and the awful toll of the depression on the profit ledger. Deficits are usually featured, but at the utility hearings not a passed dividend was even suggested. Labor met this challenge. The Brotherhood of Edison Employees of America proved that the power industry emerged from the depression—in the words of the industry itself—"practically uninjured." It showed that the dividend payments of this industry in 1932 had increased by $155,500,000 over 1927. Surplus and reserves also rose by a tidy $800,000,000. It was also shown that more than 2,000,000 additional customers were supporting the electric industry in an extraordinary state of prosperity. Meanwhile, in 1932 pay rolls had declined from the peak by $75,000,000 a year.

When the code submitted by the Edison Institute was examined, it was found to contain no fewer than sixty-seven exemptions enabling employers to escape from increased pay rolls. Not satisfied with an abnormally low labor cost, as compared with other industries, the electric industry planned to limit the operation of the code to an uncertain and insignificant fraction of employees. Thus wages in general were to be left at the old low levels while the industry pleaded increased labor costs to block rate reductions. By the confession of the Edison Institute itself, the increased cost of minimum wages to the entire industry under the code is less than ⅓ of 1 per cent of former pay rolls. Upon wholly unreliable and inaccurate data, however, the industry contended that costs would be raised more than 10 per cent as a result of the maximum-hour provisions of the code—a forty- to forty-eight-hour week, with numerous exceptions.

The insistence of the private companies that municipal plants should be covered by the code proved embarrassing. It was shown that the municipals maintained far better wages and working conditions than the private companies. In some cases, it was disclosed, municipal plants pay 33⅓ per cent higher wages than competing private companies. Municipal representatives complained, in fact, that if they were brought under the code it would tend to lower the wages they paid.

The habit of imperiously dictating terms to labor found expression in the grossly inadequate provisions of the proposed code. Unorganized for half a century, the industry has had a free hand with its 200,000 employees. Not long ago Donald Richberg, speaking of the power industry, said: "We find here an industry dominated by an un-American labor policy, denying the historic freedom of American life to its employees, and at best subjecting them to a degrading sort of paternalism." This "degrading paternalism" has taken many forms. One type is the enforced insurance schemes to which employees must subscribe their quota or suffer the displeasure of "straw bosses" or even loss of employment. Subscriptions to highly speculative stock issues of the employers at peak prices is another form of paternalism of which the industry boasts. Contributions are demanded to all manner of "charity drives." Vigorous promotion of customer stock-ownership is insisted upon. Appliance, "load-building," and profit-saving safety campaigns are only several of the daily incidents of utility employment. Power employees are probably the most harassed and coerced group of workers in the country.

Along with these practices utility companies openly foster political propaganda among their employees and customers. A concentrated drive is even now being made to enlist every one of the 200,000 utility workers as "willing subordinates"—I use the industry's own phrase—in a coordi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nated nation-wide effort to "build political fences" against rate reductions, municipal ownership, taxes, and every fancied grievance. The spirit of the old N. E. L. A. is not dead—it has merely learned to wear the immaculate shirt-front of the Edison Institute.

The NRA has given added impetus to this "degrading paternalism." Mutual benefit, social, and insurance societies have been hastily converted into company unions by many electric systems. Discarded and discredited "employee representation" plans have been hurriedly revived by others, and new ones have been foisted, ready made, upon unorganized and helpless employees. It is estimated that private power companies are spending no less than $1,000,000 a year on company-union plans — all charged to operating expenses, thereby making the consumer an unwilling and unsuspecting supporter of these frauds upon the collective-bargaining provisions of the NRA.

Surreptitious and open intimidation against genuine union activities exists in the power industry, despite Blue Eagle agreements. Employees have been forced to relinquish local-union charters; they have received subtle hints to consult company officials if they feel the "need of organization"; they are gently reminded that they *may* but are not *required* to organize for collective bargaining. Active organizers have been discharged for reasons of "economy," "efficiency," and trivial breaches of petty regulations. "Brotherhood busters" have openly boasted of their appointment by company officials. Employees in stand-by plants are intimidated by threats of shut-down, although these plants are still included in the companies' property for rate-making purposes. No conceivable device has been overlooked in the concerted plan to stifle interest in union activity. When the Brotherhood of Edison Employees of America opposed the company-union plan of the New York Edison system, 33,000 employees were informed through company channels that the brotherhood was trying to block collective bargaining. When, despite terrorization, employees are inclined to organize, their leaders are tempted with better jobs and increased wages—only to be victimized when union organization has been frustrated by the deception. Of about twenty company unions in the industry, not one appeared at Washington to oppose the niggardly code submitted by the Edison Institute. The chairman of one of these "unions" naively confessed that the president of his *company* would represent the members of his *union* before the NRA.

Electric sales now approach the peak level and it is expected that revenues will increase by $150,000,000 in the year 1934. Technological unemployment will continue, however, and under the proposed code hardly 4,000 out of 50,000 unemployed will receive jobs. The intentions of the industry, expressed by its proposed code, are clear. This code would leave employment substantially unaffected and yet serve as an obstructive device against rate reductions. Neither collective bargaining, increased purchasing power, nor substantial re-employment would be achieved by it. Finally, and of primary importance to the private companies, the code would be for them the first step toward acquiring some measure of influence over publicly owned systems.

The Birth-Control Conference

By STELLA HANAU

Washington, January 19

THE American Conference on Birth Control and National Recovery, held in Washington on January 15, 16, and 17, was marked throughout by an earnest and scientific spirit and a total absence of jingoism. Six hundred delegates, including distinguished specialists in the fields of medicine, sociology, biology, and social work, scrutinized the subject from every angle. They discussed the relation of birth control to national and international problems, to federal relief, public health, sex *mores,* maternal mortality; they appraised contraceptive methods, not hesitating to point out flaws, viewed present clinical facilities, and laid plans in orderly, concrete, and efficient manner for speeding up birth-control work and furthering scientific research.

Margaret Sanger, president of the National Committee on Federal Legislation for Birth Control and organizer of the conference, opened the proceedings with a plea for the "forgotten woman" and for the support of the bill now pending, which is designed to liberalize the federal law governing the sending through the mails of contraceptive information and supplies. From that moment until the final meeting on the evening of January 17, when a resolution was adopted urging that federal relief workers be instructed to refer the unemployed to existing birth-control clinics, the facts in themselves built up the case for birth control.

The relation of birth control to present national and international problems was ably brought out at the early sessions. Population is already affected by birth control. It remains to study how and when to control population intelligently. Warren S. Thompson, director of the Scripps Foundation for Research in Population Problems, using Japan as an apt illustration, showed that population pressure is inevitably a disturber of world peace. But war brings only temporary easement. Man must learn to adjust his numbers; population growth must come under conscious control.

Government cognizance of the conference entered at this point in the person of Mordecai Ezekiel, economic adviser to the Secretary of Agriculture. Dr. Ezekiel predicted that the population of the United States will become stable within the next few decades, and suggested that now was the time to encourage more children from the upper economic strata and fewer from the lower. Caustic exception was taken to such arbitrary division into classes; the conference was not without its currents of radicalism.

Criticism of the existing order, academically phrased, was presented in a paper on National Economic Planning by Professor Joseph J. Spengler of the University of Arizona. He pointed out two methods of national planning in which natural, artificial, and human resources may be coordinated: through the capitalistic price system and through the action

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a supreme economic council. The present system—if we abolish dishonesty in business, if we make the nation statistically introspective, if we set up permanent relief for the victims of the system through unemployment insurance, public works, and national barter corporations—will prepare the way for a planned and classless society if and when political evolution pushes us in that direction.

Passing from the general to the particular, LeRoy E. Bowman called for the immediate assumption by the community of an active, extensive, and aggressive program of birth control if we are to escape fascism.

> The trend toward fascism or a socialized state may be judged, among other evidences [he said], by the measures taken by the government on birth control. If it is a cruel, senseless, socially abortive effort, such as that of Hitler and Mussolini, to induce the propagation of many and therefore necessarily poorly trained human beings, it will be fascism we will face. If it be a community effort to control the growth of society in its own best interests by fostering the spreading of knowledge that will give to parents the control they need over their own and their children's destinies, then it will most probably be a step toward a desirable cooperative commonwealth. For a community that controls itself is a democracy; a rapidly growing mass is apt to be merely fair prey for the exploitation of a dictator and a controlling few. It is therefore far more than mere contraceptive education that becomes the responsibility of the community; it is also the greater obligation to show every parent in America the social implications of the size of the family in a poverty-stricken world and in a changing social order.

The demand that birth control be linked with government relief was emphatically made by Dr. James H. S. Bossard of the University of Pennsylvania, who said:

> We are now carrying on the biggest relief job in the history of the world. To finance this job we have utilized private philanthropy, apparently to the limit; we have drawn more than liberally upon current public incomes; and we are discounting the future through the creation of a huge bonded indebtedness. If this relief job is to be a mere doling out of aid, it means that we have learned nothing since the later days of the Roman emperors, who similarly fed and amused the populace at public expense. If, at a time when we are carrying on relief between three and four million families, we are going to deny and to legally forbid these families the use of agencies and methods which will permit them sanely to control their reproduction in the light of their present circumstances, then we are rejecting the philosophy underlying man's ascent from the jungle. To deny to self-respecting families in distress the right to self-determination in the sacred function of bringing new life into the world seems just about inconceivable.

The medical sessions and round tables brought the discussion even closer to actuality. It was agreed that birth control is a medical problem which should be handled by physicians. Present methods were evaluated, and demonstrated by models, slides, and movies. The effects of pregnancy on the pituitary and thyroid glands and the need of an interval of at least one, preferably two, summers between pregnancies was pointed out by Dr. Walter Timme, endocrine specialist. The so-called safe-period method, permitted by the Catholic church, was explained and rejected as too uncertain for general use.

Dr. Fred J. Taussig stated that conservative estimates place the number of abortions in the United States at 811,000 a year, with 17,000 resultant deaths. He believes that 80 per cent of this number might be prevented through birth-control instruction. That 13,000 lives might be saved each year if women knew how to prevent instead of terminate undesired pregnancies is food for thought.

Dr. Prentiss Willson, president of the Medical Society of the District of Columbia, presided over the medical sessions, and with commendable candor scored the lag of medicine in recognizing social needs. At the last meeting of the American Medical Association, Dr. Barton Cook Hirst, chairman of the section on Obstetrics and Gynecology, listed birth control as one of the four major problems in gynecology. At the same meeting a resolution asking that a committee be appointed to study the subject was defeated. Thus the American Medical Association placed itself on record as refusing to study one of the four major problems affecting the women of America.

The lack of standardization of commercial contraceptives, due in part to the failure of the medical profession to take hold of the problem and in part to the confusion and restrictions of the law, was shown in reports on research work carried on by Dr. Cecil I. B. Voge for the National Committee on Maternal Health and by Dr. Helen Holt of Margaret Sanger's Birth Control Clinical Research Bureau. Dr. Voge has investigated some five hundred products over the last five years, and Dr. Holt has recently completed a special test of thirty-three spermicides now on the market. Of these, 19 per cent showed defects in vital mechanical functioning, and 4 per cent proved totally inadequate. A resolution was adopted urging that a central research office be established to carry on laboratory tests of all products, and that no commercial contraceptives should be used by clinics until they have been passed by some such group. The Research Committee of the New York clinic, headed by Dr. Hannah M. Stone, is already functioning in this capacity and has done excellent pioneer work.

A comprehensive exhibition of historical material—clinical reports, mechanical devices from all parts of the world, samples of commercial advertising folders, maps, and charts—was one of the chief points of interest of the conference. Dr. Norman E. Himes exhibited a unique collection, tracing the history of birth control in print. It included Margaret Sanger's famous "Family Limitation," which fired the first shot in the birth-control war, in many editions and many languages; the June, 1914, issue of the *Woman Rebel;* the first number of the *Birth Control Review;* and a photostat of the earliest mention of birth control in the Egyptian Petri Papyrus of 1350 B.C. A large chart summarized the results of an inquiry into the work of clinics, carried out by Dr. Hannah M. Stone, medical director of the Clinical Research Bureau. In reply to a questionnaire of June, 1933, eighty-seven clinics, showing a total of 110,844 patients cared for, listed methods used and indicated research in new and simpler techniques. Present methods were reported as from 95 to 98 per cent successful.

Whatever the fate of the birth-control bill, which was given a hearing before the House Judiciary Committee on January 18 and 19, the conference has performed an invaluable service in summing up the present status of the movement, in showing the relation of birth control to economic and social problems, in charting the progressive trend of medicine in this important field.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Intelligent Traveler

By JOHN ROTHSCHILD

FOR the second season this column offers advice to *Nation* readers. It will inform them of events abroad which might otherwise escape them in their travels. It will present essential facts about little-known places and little-known facts about well-known places. It will report travel services and projects of which the traveler should take account in laying his plans. It will point out ways of saving money. Related facts will be gathered from widely scattered sources, a function which the traveler is rarely able to perform for himself.

The column will be edited solely with reference to the traveler's interests. It will be in line with the growing movement for consumer-education.

Cruising

A West Indies cruise is a restful, sunny winter holiday which takes little time, is comparatively inexpensive, and provides as complete a change of local color as if you went half around the world. Nearly every transatlantic steamship line sends boats to the Caribbean during the winter and spring. Where you go depends upon how much time and money you have to spend. Bermuda, the Bahama Islands, Havana, Jamaica, Barbados, Trinidad, all are lying in their warm southern waters waiting to be visited. A typical twelve-day trip on the Mauretania takes you to Trinidad, La Guaira, Curaçao, Colon, and Nassau and costs $170. First-class accommodations on the best boats average between $12 and $15 a day.

Coastwise boats are smaller and less swanky but are well equipped and often have been built especially for the tropics. They are more like boats and less like hotels. Rates on the United Fruit Line average $8 or $9 a day. Cruises start from Boston, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New Orleans, as well as from New York and West Coast ports. From Canada and from the port of Boston the Canadian National Steamship Line offers West Indies cruises at a little less than $8 a day. Its "vagabond" cruises from Halifax on freight boats accommodating twenty passengers cost less than $5 a day. The Standard Fruit and Steamship Company runs boats from New York to Santiago, Cuba, and Spanish Honduras, and to Jamaica and Spanish Honduras for thirteen-day cruises at about $7 a day. Furness Bermuda Line boats make twenty-three-day cruises at an average of $6 a day. With this general outline of the possibilities in your mind, consult your purse and travel agent for a few days or weeks of recreation in the sun.

Mexico and Cuba

Winter is the ideal time to become acquainted with ancient, vivid Mexico. The rainy season is just over now, the dust is settled for months to come, and everything has come into bloom. Many native fiestas and the important religious ceremonies connected with Lent and Easter will soon begin. Your winter visit may include your own exploration of the ruined civilizations of Yucatan—where it is too steamy and hot in summer even for archaeologists. Ward Line boats, which have a round-trip rate to Mexico City of $160, stop at Havana and at the port of Progresso in Yucatan, where you can stop over until the next boat a week later, doing the ruins thoroughly. If you prefer to view the ruined temples from the air, you can fly from Mexico City over the route that Lindbergh charted, in one of the daily planes of the Pan-American Airways.

Besides the pleasant and inexpensive boat trip from New York, you can go by steamer and return by rail through northern Mexico and the Southwest on a Ward Line circle tour which costs $180. If you live in the Middle West and must go by train, the Missouri Pacific operates the Sunshine Special from St. Louis, a crack train which reaches Mexico City in sixty-one hours. A twenty-three-day excursion costs $79.75 in fare; a ticket good for six months costs $20 more.

For flying enthusiasts the Pan-American Airways operates planes from many airports. The trip from Miami to Mexico City is popular. It takes less than two days, counting an overnight stop, and costs $153 one way. From Brownsville, Texas, the rate is $61—Mexico City is only five hours away by air.

The old cities of Mazatlan and Manzanillo, which D. H. Lawrence liked best of all Mexico, can be reached by a Grace Line cabin boat through the Panama Canal for as little as $150, one way. The steamer ticket's destination is California, but since it is good for one year, you may stop off as long as you like in the coast cities.

For years there have been rumors of how cheaply and comfortably one can live in Mexico "if one finds the right place." Finding the right place has been a matter of luck until recently. Now you may consult the Personal Travel Service conducted by Enrique Aguirre, who was formerly representative in Mexico of the Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America. Señor Aguirre can find you charming accommodations and good food in semi-private places that resemble French pensions, which will cost as little as a hundred pesos a month—or about $30. You may enlist his help in planning what to see in Mexico, and since he is a writer and lecturer himself, his suggestions are likely to interest the Intelligent Traveler. Señor Aguirre can be found at the American Bookstore in Mexico City.

A most helpful source of advance information about Mexico is the Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America. Its address is 112 East Nineteenth Street, New York.

"The Seminar in Cuba" under the auspices of the Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America, will be held in Havana from March 8 to March 14. It is the first of these valuable seminars to concern itself exclusively with Cuba, although the third of the Caribbean series. The plan of the Mexican seminar, which has proved so fruitful in international understanding, will be followed in Cuba—formal lectures by Cuban and American leaders and close round-table discussions. The American faculty will include Dr. Chester Lloyd Jones, of the University of Wisconsin, Elizabeth Wallace, of the University of Chicago, and Hubert C. Herring, executive director of the Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America. The party will be limited to between thirty-five and fifty members, and will sail on the Morro Castle on March 4. All expenses are included in the price of $218.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Driftway

WHAT may well turn out to be the book of the season is offered in a circular which deserves quoting. The book is the "New Dictionary of Thoughts" and it contains 20,000 of the "best thoughts on important and interesting subjects."

> Both a stepping-stone and arch support to literary attainment. . . . Put punch and power into your speech, articles, advertisements, stories, sermons; add charm to conversation by quoting the gems of all literature, which makes you a leader in culture and influence. .

At present most communication, spoken or written, is conducted by means of clichés. This is likely to be true, the profound thinkers will tell you if they get a chance, in an age when all the old values are worn out and no new ones have been established. To shift from clichés to quotations might be refreshing provided an attempt were made to keep both quotations and sources varied. The shift might even be educational if the rules required quotation marks and a knowledge of sources. Such rules would have prevented, for instance, the public amazement of the reviewer who commented upon T. S. Eliot's great diversity of rhythm, and cited as an example of one mode the mellifluous line, "Sweet Thames, run softly till I end my song."

* * * * *

THIS marvelous dictionary is especially commended to editors, and "like a bolt from the blue" came the reflection that it would be of inestimable value to the Drifter's colleagues, the editors of *The Nation,* in those hours just before press time when the news persists in pouring in. Suppose, for instance, that President Roosevelt has announced that henceforth marines will not be landed in any Latin American country. For the editor thoroughly familiarized with these 700 pages and 20,000 thoughts it would be a matter of minutes to compose the following rousing editorial:

> Apparently the "Colossus of the North" intends no more to "chase brave employment with a naked sword throughout the world." Mr. Roosevelt might well be called the 'great corrector of enormous times." But, alas, "Hell is paved with good intentions." "We grant, although he had much wit, he was very shy of using it" and unfortunately we cannot "take the will for the deed." "Justice," Mr. Roosevelt, "is truth in action." "The manly part is to do with might and main what you can do." knowing that "the reward of a thing well done is to have done it."

And incidentally, if the editors need a "snapper" with which to end their sometimes unfavorable comment on public men, the Drifter suggests the following: "All your better deeds shall be in water writ, but this in marble."

* * * * *

IN order to help the cause of conversation by quotation the Drifter urges his readers to write their plays, novels, articles, and poems in the new medium—especially poems; and he will give a prize of one slightly used but excellently preserved quotation suitable for almost all occasions to the person who can give correctly the sources used in the paragraph above.

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

The Youth Conference Again

TO THE EDITORS OF THE NATION:

It seems to me that Selden Rodman's article Youth Meets in Washington, printed in your issue of January 17, gives an entirely false impression of what happened at the National Conference of Students in Politics. I attended the conference as a neutral observer, and what I saw bore a very slight resemblance indeed to what Mr. Rodman reports.

The conference was called by a self-appointed executive committee, and that committee continued to rule to the end. It imposed on the discussion certain arbitrary restrictions which seemed to me and to many others both unwise and unnecessary. But what is of greater significance, it called the conference in the United States Chamber of Commerce building, and in order to obtain the use of that building it gave its pledge that no resolutions would be drawn and no program passed. This fact was not announced to the conference until the course of the discussion compelled the announcement.

But since the conference had already signified its desire to have a program, the chairman suggested a means of evading the promise to the building management, and his suggestion was adopted by a show of hands. It was that the executive committee be instructed to draw up a résumé of the sense of the meeting. Persons in the group who wished to protest were not permitted to speak, and no opportunity was given to elect a new committee from the body of the conference. The chairman's suggestion was adopted by a conference which had not been allowed to hear any discussion of it. When, on the following day, the committee read its résumé and then promptly adjourned the conference without permitting discussion or putting it to a vote, certain N. S. L. men protested, I think quite justly, and there was a tense minute when violence seemed imminent—perpetrated, paradoxically enough, by the Socialist delegates in their frantic efforts to silence a protesting Communist.

But just when emotion was running at its highest, there entered the room an emissary from President Roosevelt, bearing greetings and fatherly blessings. The meeting was called to order, and all protesters politely stopped speaking. The conference broke up with every outward sign of peace.

In all this I can see no grounds for reproaching the N. S. L. Its delegates seemed to me to observe all the niceties of gentlemanly behavior; they certainly had every reason to feel resentful at the treatment they received from the committee. In this case I am afraid it was the L. I. D. and Mr. Rodman who attempted to "capture" the meeting, and not the N. S. L.

New York, January 11 VARIAN FRY

In Memory of "Marse Henry"

TO THE EDITORS OF THE NATION:

December 22, 1933, marked the twelfth anniversary of the death of Colonel Henry Watterson, who, if alive today, would have rejoiced at the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, and who would have been saddened by the recrudescence of lynchings. "The public," said *The Nation* of August 17, 1918, "ought never to forget his [Henry Watterson's] steadfast, life-long opposition to protective tariffs, his brave resistance to Ku Kluxism when it was perilous to denounce it, and his outspoken warnings against the government of America by imperialists, militarists, and great business interests intrenched through special privilege—warnings never so much in order as today when the men-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ace of Prussianism is upon us. . . ." If we substitute the word Hitlerism for Prussianism, the editorial statement of *The Nation* is brought up to date.

Upon this occasion of the anniversary of "Marse Henry's" death, we can turn profitably to the writings of one who in his day formulated constructive, far-reaching social and political programs and urged them unceasingly.

New York, December 30 LOUIS MARDER

Finance

Wall Street Plays 'Possum

THE large brokers who dictate the policies of the Stock Exchange have at last been brought to the realization that expediency requires them to lay off pools for the time being. They have been led to adopt this policy of self-denial by the growing public demand for stringent regulation of the stock markets and by the mounting evidence that the Administration was apparently prepared to demand legislation establishing such control. The stupid bungling which allowed the petty operation in Atlas Tack to explode in a burst of unfavorable publicity just prior to the convening of a hostile Congress was the final spur.

The present market illustrates the extent of the Street's self-sacrifice. When the President's proposed monetary legislation was announced, the market was prepared for a substantial rise. While the measure gave some encouragement to the bond market it was interpreted as particularly stimulating to stock equities. Prices responded with the expected rise. Also many of the standard business indexes on which speculation is based have been showing moderate improvement, and outside buying has returned to the Exchange in greater volume than at any time since last July.

But for probably the first time in its history Wall Street has so far failed to respond to these inviting opportunities with the usual large-scale pool operations. Some large pools in the process of organization have been persuaded to withhold their operations and in others, where opportunities for pool manipulation normally would be enticing, there have been no takers pending a more favorable trend in public and governmental opinion. While the daily volume of transactions on the Exchange has mounted to around three million shares, informed opinion in Wall Street is that prevailing conditions would permit a much larger volume of trading if unrestricted pool operations, such as existed as recently as last July, were resumed. The difference between three- and four-million-share days and five-, six-, and seven-million-share days is what makes the pool so dear to Wall Street's heart.

The present situation is without precedent in the recent attempts of the Exchange to expand control over its members. For years the authorities of the Exchange stoutly denied the possibility of large-scale manipulation of stock prices. Not until last August was the Exchange compelled to admit that undesirable activities might occasionally break out. But the metaphysical line of separation which the Exchange draws between "legitimate" and "undesirable" pools automatically bars it from interfering formally with the large pool characteristic of the usual market operation. Consequently, the absence of important manipulation in the present market, whether at the suggestion of the Exchange or through caution on the part of operators, is a product of expediency rather than of internal regulation.

There appears to be a significant relationship between this unusual willingness of brokers to forgo immediate profits and a pronounced shift in sentiment in Wall Street on the outlook for federal regulation. During November and December, when it was subject to continual attacks through the revelations at Washington, Wall Street was resigned to the prospect of federal control of one type or another and was devoting all its energies to making that type as innocuous as possible. At the present time the Street is taking a much more optimistic view of its status in Washington. The feeling is prevalent that federal legislation either will be postponed until some indefinite future date or will be of a nature unlikely seriously to embarrass Wall Street activities.

At any rate, the Exchange has been careful to avoid publicizing the present absence of pool operations. In contrast to past attempts at "reform," when harmless measures were widely advertised while the essential practices of the market continued unchecked, the Exchange in this instance has concentrated public attention on steps taken to tighten restrictions on the financial practices of companies listed on its board. Although of value in themselves, these measures are quite apart from the present question of internal regulation. The frantic haste with which President Whitney recently repudiated newspaper articles on an impending propaganda campaign by the Exchange is symptomatic of its anxiety to avoid the appearance of influencing public opinion at a time when its whole effort is in reality toward that goal. Pools have been mentioned only in the Exchange's official whitewash of the manipulation in alcohol stocks last year and in its admission, at the Atlas Tack hearings, that the use of questionnaires on pool operations, which proved so barren of result in that instance, would be expanded in the future. An error of strategy obviously would be committed if the Exchange were to go on record against pool operations as a whole, since a commitment now might prove highly embarrassing if a resumption of these activities should become feasible at some future time. PETER HELMOOP NOYES

THE
PUPPET-SHOW
ON THE
POTOMAC
By RUFUS DART II

Who are the puppets in Washington? Who the puppet-masters? Who writes the speeches our statesmen deliver? What goes on at Cabinet and other meetings? Who controls the social rackets? How much does it cost to get a daughter presented at court? By a man who was assistant to a member of the Cabinet in three administrations. $2.50

KAPOOT
By CARVETH WELLS

Don't form any opinion about Russia today until you have read this striking and widely popular book by one of the world's foremost travelers.
Fifth large edition. $2.50

BIRTH CONTROL
IN PRACTICE
By MARIE E. KOPP, Ph. D.

A statistical study of 10,000 Case Histories of the Birth Control Clinical Research Bureau. Margaret Sanger, Director.

The most complete and scientific book on birth control. It presents in direct, readable English the facts derived from ten years of social and medical study. The greatest survey ever made by a committee of the most distinguished scientists in the country. $3.75

Robert M. McBride & Co. 4 W. 16th St., N.Y.

When writing to advertisers please mention The Nation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books and Drama

Winter Revery

By SARA BARD FIELD

Now let the garden sleep.
Bank the red coals of your impatience
Under the ash of prunings and raked leaves
And swing your eager glance
By the late-rising, early-setting sun's
Short and remoter arc. This is no hour to sweep
The quiet self-sufficient dark with flame.
Earth has forgotten fire, to light indifferent grown.
Night and the North alone attend her now.
Colder than ocean, cold as stone her blood,
Her pulses slow in long, libational rhythms.
Therefore if you would haunt the leafless paths,
Ally, not alien, go in winter's way:
Not one superfluous candle in your eyes,
Nor heat of haste searing the ground with footprints.
Rather in shoes heavy with gathered snow
Or padded with thick cling of sodden leaves,
Your breath a cloud of chilly vapor,
Drift through the barren quiet like a sleepy mist
That coldly mingles with an austere dream.

Wanted: An Attitude

PERHAPS nothing seems more out of fashion than a book that was read by everyone ten years ago; in one sense it seems more ancient than a Victorian novel and infinitely more outmoded than a hearty survivor from the eighteenth century. So much for such best-sellers as "Black Oxen," which is now superseded by "The Good Earth" and "Anthony Adverse," but what of those items that we regarded as literature, that were as necessary to our education as a grasp of the binomial theorem or the demonstrations of Euclid? Not to read Edward Carpenter's "Love's Coming of Age," Shaw's "Unsocial Socialist," Anatole France's "The Queen Pedauque," and Flaubert's "Temptation of St. Anthony" was a confession of indifference to the best in contemporary culture; these were the means of self-education by which one created a standard for further reading and a discussion of "modern" problems.

These very titles, however, are among those dropped by the Modern Library for 1934 publication; obviously they are omitted because they no longer sell even as reprints in moderately priced editions. It is hard to say that this omission proves anything concerning a rise in public taste, or that the substitution of "The Good Earth" and "God's Little Acre" indicates the reverse. Nor does it mean that the continued popularity of "Das Kapital" on the Modern Library list proves that half of America is about to vote the Communist ticket in the next election. Yet it does show, I think, that public taste has turned a sharp corner and that our notions of what is good to read have undergone a definite change.

The Modern Library, as I have seen it, has always represented a shrewd compromise between the current best-seller and the book that was likely to educate the public in what it wanted to know. It is perhaps the only successful example in America of publishing books directly for the consumer, of giving him at a cut rate books that he wishes to read and own. All other successful publishing ventures have another purpose in mind, that is to say, they advertise and market books so as to make them attractive as gifts. Therefore the Modern Library has a special function and as an index of popular thinking has specific relevance.

The omission of such important items as "Love's Coming of Age" and "The Unsocial Socialist" does not indicate that we have wearied of sex or economics, but that we have shifted our attitude toward two vital subjects. Ten years ago we were happy and, perhaps, excited to know that a frank discussion of sexual experience was possible in print. A knowledge of that experience by means of the printed page was considered essential to general education; such knowledge and the free discussion of it were the mark of sophistication, but it was not essential to have a fixed attitude concerning it. To know the jargon of the experience was quite enough, and if one could pass from Carpenter to Freud a victory was gained. In fiction Anatole France represented the ease with which a minor sexual episode might be treated, and open discussion of the subject could take on lighter aspects. Something of the same sophistication was demanded in the matter of economics; the attractive element in Shaw's Fabianism lay in his ability to write about economics in the form of novels, prefaces, or plays. Again there was no necessity to make up one's mind concerning socialism; it was enough to know that economic forces existed, that they interfered with our love affairs and the quality of the food we ate for dinner.

Today it is no longer possible to drift happily upon a stream of such broadness and indecision. If we are inclined to speak of sexual experience at all, our position concerning it becomes more important than the mere fact that we have read about it; and if we speak of economics we are likely to think of such forces in absolute terms, involving problems of right and wrong. Even our notions of free speech are becoming modified to suit our temper, the choice of subject is now given a moral aspect, and for approval of our changing habits we witness a revival of nineteenth-century virtue in "Little Women," reread fragments of Karl Marx, and respond to the Biblical intonations heard again in the earnest, heavily stylized prose of "The Good Earth."

HORACE GREGORY

Objet d'Art

Work of Art. By Sinclair Lewis. Doubleday, Doran and Company. $2.50.

THE division of Mr. Lewis's work into satires and biographical romances has been obvious ever since the publication of "Arrowsmith." What is becoming apparent through his most recent novels is that there is a distinction of another kind gradually separating these two classifications, a distinction of quality. The books in the latter group are not Mr. Lewis's most successful works, and "Work of Art," another biographical romance, is the poorest of these.

The chronicle of Myron Weagle's life as a hotel man is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

related with all Mr. Lewis's usual care in documentation and editing. The value and scope of an apprenticeship begun in adolescence as a handy boy in a small, old-fashioned rural hotel and continued through the successive stages of bell-hop, cook, night clerk, clerk, manager, and vice-president of a hotel chain are fully demonstrated by sufficient examples. The requirements of a good bartender are made as clear as the distinction between running commercial houses in the nineties with either legitimate or shady traffic and the management of pasteboard contraptions for the St. Louis Exposition and Florida resorts where the bar is more important than the beds. There is an accurate indication of the day New York lobbies lost their gilt, and the potato penholder in places like the American House in Black Thread Center, Connecticut, was supplanted by gunshot. The influence of certain lady guests on a hotel-keeper's life is explicit; and Myron's marriage to a good girl from his home town is made inevitable.

But too many pages of "Work of Art" read like either a trade manual or a trade report, and too few read like a novel. Toward the end of the book the material does cease for a few chapters to bear the imprint of undigested research and becomes enlivened fiction. While the Perfect Inn is being built and destroyed Myron reaches human stature, and the use of extracts from his diary gives a needed, intensified impetus to the narrative. Yet at the end the story weakens again, and no amount of admiration for Myron's taste in cooking or conviction of Kansas's great need for such an art could arouse enthusiasm for the tale or the telling of it.

The biography suffers principally because none of Mr. Lewis's major talents are put at Myron's disposal. There are only the feeblest hints of an ability to evoke through the experiences of one character a huge social panorama. J. Hector Warlock, old Elphinstone, and Herbert Lammkin are barely perceptible from Mr. Lewis's stock of generalizations on the people a young hotel-keeper may meet, and in the precincts of kitchen, office, and front desk Myron finds no vivid world. Absent also is any full evidence of Mr. Lewis's extraordinary gift for dialogue, dialogue that at one and the same time creates, differentiates, and appraises characters, dialogue of the most literal and animated vernacular, surprising in its accuracy and fitness. Compared to the conversation of Mr. Schmaltz and his friend Mr. Babbitt, J. Hector's poker game and Mrs. Koreball's cocktail party sound like bad recording. Nor by tabulation and exposition has Mr. Lewis substituted a better method for making characters. The result is that no figure stands out here like Carol or Arrowsmith. None displays that especially adroit talent by which the author has made an individual and a type under the same identity. Myron is too often only synonymous with a John Doe who is following every course offered in a trade-school catalogue. When, three-quarters of the way through the book, he emerges an honor to his calling, well-trained and devoid of hokum, Mr. Lewis himself seems to realize that so far the career has hidden the man, and he sends him off about his more individual business—to the Perfect Inn, failure, and a quiet retreat in Kansas.

This, unfortunately, is as close to Myron, the man, as one gets, and still more unfortunately it is not close enough to make us accept him as the poet his creator would have him. He is, certainly, compared to Ora and salvation-by-Hollywood a restful figure, and his sober singleness of purpose and calm adaptability are sympathetic traits, but as he is left with these as the chief assets of his personality he does not make a deep impression. He is not canonized by either ridicule or romance. The sense of quest which Mr. Lewis in his other biographies has put in place of satire, the feeling that the sport is worth the candle, is precisely what he has omitted in "Work of Art."

FLORENCE CODMAN

Johnson's England

Johnson's England. Edited by A. S. Turberville. Oxford University Press. Two Volumes. $14.

The Poems of Charles Churchill. Edited by James Laver. The King's Printers' Editions. The Viking Press. Two Volumes. $12.50.

THE less one knows about the eighteenth century, the more convenient it is as a symbol. For that very reason some of the persons who refer to it most often will probably resist the invitation to read the two handsome and authoritative volumes edited by Professor Turberville and packed with detailed information. If, on the other hand, anyone really wants to know how, where, and under what conditions the Englishman of the period lived, there is probably no better way of finding out. G. M. Trevelyan contributes the general chapter on history, Osbert Sitwell and Mary Barton that on taste; but there are also twenty-five others by various hands which pretty well cover the physical, intellectual, and artistic life of the time. The amount of specific information is enormous; the generalizations relatively few and cautious. No one pretends that anything can be "summed up" in a phrase or an illustration, and the reader is likely to come away with the conviction that the eighteenth century, like every other time in human history, was, in the familiar phrase, "an age of contradictions and an age of change."

At one time or another most of us have been guilty of referring to what sometimes seems to be the orderly homogeneous culture attributed to Johnson and his contemporaries. Looking back, it often seems that the literary man especially was fortunate in having a clearly delimitated field, and that an especial kind of perfection was possible then for the very reason that there was so little tendency to transcend the accepted bounds. We think of the writer as happily cultivating his garden while we are perpetually busy with the almost hopeless task of clearing the limitless wilderness of newly discovered facts and newly explored sensibilities. But in so far as the conception is true at all, the fact is due more to the attitude of the writer than to any lack of what we call progress in the various departments of human activity. Many men did, like Dr. Johnson, tend to regard the classical themes and the classical attitudes as the only ones with which a man of culture was bound to be familiar. Though Johnson, for example, amused himself with chemical experiments and though he did not, as Chesterfield did, warn his disciples against frittering away their time on natural curiosities, he certainly would have regarded science as a kind of knowledge infinitely less important than knowledge of Vergil. In other words, the cultivated man did not feel the same obligation which the cultivated man of today feels toward all the movements of thought; and some of the most characteristic writing of the period retains that Augustan flavor possible only to a literature of which the subject mater is narrowly defined. But that does not mean that there was anything static about the age as a whole. Important discoveries were being made in science, revolutionary political ideas filled the air, and, to take a single illustration, the growth of good roads was changing both the physical appearance of the country and the habits of the people.

One of the great virtues of the work under consideration is that it nowhere overemphasizes those figures or those characteristics which are responsible for the usual conception of the period, but launches forth into a detailed examination of the schools, the houses, the inns, the theaters, and the parks, and concerns itself no less with religion, science, politics, and economics than with literature. The result is fatal to any tendency to think of the century in simple terms, but it is also to make

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it seem spiritually less remote. Johnson's contemporaries were certainly not living in a fixed or stable world. Except for certain literary purposes, they probably did not even think that they were.

As for Charles Churchill, whose works are elaborately edited and handsomely printed, with an extensive biographical study by James Laver, he is doubtless best remembered by Johnson's famous and just remark about the crab tree which could produce nothing but crabs though it deserved praise for at least bearing a large crop of them. Mr. Laver provides an excellent account of Churchill's far from edifying career, which might, indeed, be taken as an extended illustration of the less attractive side of eighteenth-century literary life. After beginning as a clergyman because he did not know how else to make a living, Churchill went to London, achieved an enormous success as a writer of something between literature and libel, formed an intimacy with Wilkes, and died of hard living less than four years after the beginning of his prosperity. Exemplifying the eighteenth century at very nearly its most brutal and most corrupt, his poems are what one might expect from such a mind and such a life. The famous Rosciad is certainly the best, but all are marked by vigor which approaches savagery and reckless satire which seems always upon the point of degenerating into mere scurrility. Yet Churchill is, after all, the last in the great line of eighteenth-century couplet writers. In the hands of the respectable poets, except for Cowper, the form had lost all fire. Churchill recaptured something of the fire, though certainly nothing of the polish, of Pope.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Europe Before the War

Fifty Years of Europe. By J. A. Spender. Frederick A. Stokes Company. $5.

IT would be difficult to overpraise Mr. Spender's survey of European history from 1871 to 1914. It ranks with Fay's volumes on "The Origins of the War" and with Brandenburg's masterly treatise "From Bismarck to the World War"; and it is desirable that French and German translations should appear as soon as possible. For the author is not only a patriotic Englishman but a good European, not only a great journalist but a historian and a judge. He has known many of the statesmen whose work he describes, and on British policy he speaks with the authority of an intimate friend of Grey. He is also quite at home in the vast ocean of official publications, as well as in the biographies and apologias of the protagonists. He is a master of arrangement, and his lucidity makes complicated issues plain. He never raises his voice, but we are none the less conscious throughout of his warm human interest in the peace and happiness of mankind.

It is a commonplace today that the causes of the World War must be sought not in the last five weeks of peace but in the decades that went before. The best starting-point is undoubtedly the creation of the German Empire, which ushered in the system that perished in 1914. Its main author was Bismarck; its main feature was the division of the Powers into rival groups; its cardinal doctrine was the supremacy of force. Mr. Spender tells the story of power-politics at its height, leading, as it was bound to lead, to a catastrophe. All the Powers played the perilous game with varying success. Bismarck, the greatest of experts, performed miracles of diplomatic skill; but his occasional habit of bludgeoning his opponents was a psychological blunder, and his treatment of defeated France was a costly mistake. "The main weakness of his policy," says Mr. Spender with perfect truth, "lay in its foundations. The idea of finding security for one nation in the permanent subjection and outlawry of another was in the long run doomed to failure." The policy of keeping France in quarantine was breaking down while the Iron Chancellor was still at the helm, and after his fall in 1890 it speedily collapsed. The first hundred pages are on the Bismarckian system and the Bismarckian era, and they are one of the best portions of the book.

When Bismarck was gone, his forceful methods were carried on by successors who lacked his skill and abandoned his saving principle of limited liability. "Holstein, the Kaiser, and Bülow were a trio of incomprehensibles to British statesmen: Holstein burrowing like a mole, Bülow performing on a tight-rope, and the Kaiser dancing about between the two, now currying favor with us as our best friend, now stabbing us in the back, and always improving the occasion to point the eternal moral that Germany was helpless without a big fleet." Of their mistakes in alienating England by the *Flottenpolitik*, and forcing England and France into an unwritten alliance, Mr. Spender writes with just severity. But he never for a moment falls back into the foolish and facile generalization current during the war and later that Germany was the one black sheep in a relatively well-behaved flock. It is one of the merits of the book that the author recognizes the immense and ever-increasing significance of Vienna in the last years of peace; he agrees with the majority of the experts that under Bülow and Bethmann Austria was the rider and Germany the horse. For the naval rivalry with England and the recurring disputes with France over Morocco called the Triple Entente into being and left the Kaiser with no alternative but to cling closely to his only dependable ally. At the very end of his long term of office Bülow began to realize the danger of the *Flottenpolitik;* but it was too late. The political morality of Germany was no worse than that of most of the other Powers, but her mistakes were numerous and irrevocable. In Mr. Spender's opinion French diplomacy was the most skilful, while the British record wins the prize for candor and rectitude.

The ultimate cause of the war was not the misdeeds of this or that country or statesman but "the system by which the nations dealt with one another in these years, and its total incompatibility with the good life desired by the vast majority of human beings." The last phase of the disintegration of an anarchical Europe is dated by Mr. Spender from the annexation of Bosnia in 1908, which divided the Continent sharply into two hostile groups, reopened the Eastern question, and was followed by the Tripoli and Balkan wars. The Agadir crisis of 1911 was a terrifying interlude in the West, but from 1908 onwards the main anxieties were found in the East. Mr. Spender emphasizes the importance of Conrad and his unceasing demand for preventive wars against hostile Serbia and disloyal Italy before Russia regained her fighting strength. The aged Francis Joseph desired to close his eyes in peace, but Berchtold was gradually won over to a policy of action. He was encouraged by a historic conversation with the Kaiser, in October, 1913, shortly after the conclusion of the Balkan wars. In speaking of the possibility that Serbia might resist the demands of Austria the Kaiser declared: "You may rest assured that I stand beside you and am ready to draw the sword whenever your initiative makes it necessary." Austria could count absolutely and completely upon him. Whatever came from the Vienna Foreign Office was a command for him.

Such words were enough to make Bismarck turn in his grave, for in creating the Dual Alliance in 1879 he desired to prevent and not to provoke a war with Russia. Berchtold had now the blank check in his pocket, and he could cash it whenever he liked. Russia was rapidly regaining her strength, and her encouragement of pan-Serb aspirations was becoming scandalously notorious. The Sarajevo murders provided the pretext; but Mr. Spender believes that in any case Austria would have struck out before very long. A life-and-death struggle

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with Russia was regarded in both countries as virtually inevitable, and according to the bad old rules of the game it seemed best to fight while there was still a chance of victory. The volume ends with an argument that Grey did all that man could do to avert the catastrophe, and that when his efforts failed we had no choice but to enter the war. The moral of the tragic story is that the old cynical system of power-politics led inevitably to war, and that unless we trample it under our feet it will do so again.

G. P. Gooch

The Southwest and Its People

Mesa Land. By Anna Wilmarth Ickes. Houghton Mifflin Company. $3.

"MESA LAND" is a book many people have been waiting for these several years. Most of the material in it has been handled elsewhere, and more than once, but nowhere has it all been so thoroughly collected, sifted, and compacted into uniformity. At no time has the average reader been able to get through the country, described competently, with less than three to five volumes. "Mesa Land" is that country which is contained between the Rio Grande and the Rio Colorado east and west, the high knot of the Rockies on the north and the Mexican border on the south—a land of vast flat levels and knife-cut gorges, a land of explicit, unrivaled topographies and distinctive alien cultures. And incidentally, of the most unique and dramatic histories.

Mrs. Ickes begins her account of it with a chain of tinkling incident, color, and form—cave dwellings, ruined pueblos, racketing rivers, camel herds, tribal ceremonies—and so drops into the history of its various peoples, from the long walk of Cabeza de Vaca to the latest artistic invasion. It includes scamped but reliable accounts of the investigations of Fray Marco de Niza, adequate mention of Coronado, of Espejo, of De Sosa and the town he ran away with, of the founding of Santa Fé by Oñate, the rebellion of Popé, and the final reconquest by De Vargas, and enough of modern mention to carry the story of Santa Fé down to the present hour with intelligence and, for so short an account, with great clearness. Mrs. Ickes does not, however, begin her history of the Indians with the oldest tribes; rather, indeed, with the youngest, the Navajo, who came into the country not much ahead of the Spaniard and goes far to outstrip him in bids for our attention. The Navajos not only have increased their numbers more rapidly than any existing tribe, but have also outstripped all the others in the manner in which they have taken on the white man's salient trait of material progress and made of themselves another of the contributive peoples in the great American medley. Mrs. Ickes gives a complete and enlightening account of the Navajo and his ways, but she does not go very deeply into his psychology and so fails to be prophetic as to the final outcome of his singularly successful struggle with the white environment.

The author of "Mesa Land" goes more deeply into the past of the Pueblo groups, and more descriptively into the living constitution of the Pueblo peoples. Her account of the dead cities is interesting and more complete than is usual in a book of this character, and her discourse on the living pueblos includes a page diagram of tribal and linguistic relationships which should prove helpful to the tourist first venturing in that singular melange of primitive peoples. The general account of these people is more explicit and has none of the popular errors that characterize most accounts of the Southwestern groups. More attention is given to the older groups, the Zuñi and Hopi peoples. There are careful accounts of the social organization of these singular and slowly disappearing tribes, in particular, the Shaliko and the Stick Race of the Zuñi and the Snake Dance of the Hopi. These are followed by shorter accounts of the Rio Grande Pueblos, carefully particularized.

The volume closes with a note on the snake and the eagle as these appear in the universal lore of the Southwestern tribes, including an interpretative note on their relationship to natural phenomena, such as the track of the lightning and the fecundating powers of storm and rain. At all points the book is thoroughly reliable, and the author at no point exceeds her knowledge in her interpretations. It gives rise to the question whether the wife of any other Cabinet official could write so soundly on any of the subjects that come under her husband's control. This is the most important and faithfully written guidebook of the region described that has yet come under the reviewer's notice.

Mary Austin

Shorter Notices

L'Affaire Jones. By Hillel Bernstein. Frederick A. Stokes Company. $2.50.

Like his hero, Mr. Bernstein is a "grand ami de la France" who has been slightly disconcerted by the Frenchman's habit of introducing Verdun and *la patrie* into conversations where, to the non-Gallic mind, they do not seem to belong. His reply is a rollicking satirical farce about a young man who came to Paris to write a cookbook, soon found himself imprisoned as a dangerous spy, and fell in love with a woman to whom the *crime passionnel* had become a habit. While not exactly esoteric, the book will probably be most amusing to those who know something of the manners of the concierge and the garçon; to such it is certain to afford a great many chuckles. Soglow contributes a jacket and end pieces beautifully in the spirit of the satire.

Nature and Nurture. By Lancelot Hogben. London: Williams and Norgate. 6*s.* 6*d.*

In striking contrast to the glib distortions of history and biology by eugenists who ascribe the rise and fall of civilizations to the permutations of human heredity, Dr. Hogben, who is professor of social biology at the University of London, recognizes the sharp demarcation between cultural and biological inheritance and conceives the study of human genetics in terms of medical research. Outspoken on the limitations of present knowledge of human heredity, he is none the less sanguine that it will soon be possible to construct a chromosome map of the human species—a project which would have been regarded as fantastic a few years ago and may still be a premature expectation. As many as thirty incurable diseases are, however, now known to be determined by genes whose existence is established by quantitative agreement with the requirements of Mendel's laws. This does not lead the author to the formulation of rash generalizations and eugenic panaceas in terms of heredity. On the contrary, in his extremely able discussion of nature and nurture he stresses the fact that the same gene may be responsible for many and various manifestations, depending upon the kind of environment in which its development occurs, and that the effect of a gene depends on all other genes with which it is combined. He declares, opposing the vociferous eugenists, that simple primary amentia is a sociological not a clinical category; that the prevalence of mental defects is less of a menace to the survival of culture than the selfishness, apathy, and prejudice which prevent intellectually gifted people from understanding the character of the present economic crisis. The major part of the book deals in a highly statistical manner with the application and limitation of the principle of random mating, with consanguineous parentage and the theory of inbreeding, and with a genetical analysis of familial diseases; it is thus a rich

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH says

AH, WILDERNESS! Guild Theater. O'Neill's nostalgic comedy about a youth who discovers love and poetry together. Made doubly effective by the performance of George M. Cohan.

AS THOUSANDS CHEER. Music Box. The best musical review of the year with Clifton Webb, Leslie Adams, Helen Broderick, and Marilyn Miller in a series of acid but amusing sketches.

BIG HEARTED HERBERT. Biltmore Theater. J. C. Nugent and Elisabeth Risdon in a broad but funny farce about the taming of a self-made man.

COME OF AGE. Maxine Elliott's Theater. Reviewed in this issue.

DAYS WITHOUT END. Henry Miller's Theater. O'Neill's latest and much discussed play which may or may not prove that he is ready for conversion to the Catholic Church. Splendidly produced and acted, but not likely to seem very significant to those not religiously inclined.

HER MASTER'S VOICE. Plymouth Theater. First-rate specimen of Clare Kummer's very special kind of wit with Roland Young and Laura Hope Crews.

MARY OF SCOTLAND. Alvin Theater. Helen Hayes and Philip Merivale give fine performances in Maxwell Anderson's play. The biggest dramatic hit of the moment but one which left me a little cold.

MEN IN WHITE. Broadhurst Theater. Fine teamwork on the part of the members of the Group Theater helps to make this play about a young doctor one of the things which must not be missed.

PEACE ON EARTH. Civic Repertory Theater. Propaganda play about the next war, in which the workers strike and a young college professor gets framed for murder. Drawing special but enthusiastic audiences which evidently do not agree with me that the play is quite uninspired.

SHE LOVES ME NOT. Morosco Theater. Mad doings at Princeton which involve the efforts of some high-minded students to rescue a not too innocent maiden in distress. Much the funniest farce of the year.

THE FIRST APPLE. Ritz Theater. Irene Purcell contributes much charm to a fragile but amusing comedy about—first apples.

THE GREEN BAY TREE. Cort Theater. Absorbing psychological drama about a young man who cannot give up luxury for love. Shares with "Men in White" the first place on the list of dramas.

THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS. Avon Theater. Spicy and more or less historical comedy about a young Austrian who finds bundling one of the pleasantest of the new freedoms in Revolutionary New England.

THE LAKE. Avon Theater. Katharine Hepburn in an English tragedy which came highly recommended. Neither the play nor the star quite up to expectations.

TOBACCO ROAD. 48th Street Theater. Superb performance by Henry Hull in a grotesquely humorous play about total depravity as exhibited by the poor whites of Georgia. Dramatized from a novel by Erskine Caldwell and not likely to be forgotten even by those who find it a little too strong for their stomachs.

The Next Session of
THE NATION'S RADIOTORIAL BOARD
over Station W.E.V.D.
will take place on Wednesday, Jan. 31, at 8 P.M.

Members of the Board are

Elmer Davis — Algernon Lee
Morris L. Ernst — Bishop Francis J. McConnell
Arthur Garfield Hays — Norman Thomas
Harry W. Laidler — Walter White
and the Editors of THE NATION

fare reserved for initiated specialists. Finally, after a skilful critique and refutation of Fisher's attempt to show the unimportance of nurture in the determination of stature, he warns of the danger of concealing assumptions which have no factual basis behind an impressive façade of flawless algebra, an admonition which has particular pertinence when applied to the work of the biometricians.

George Washington Himself. By John C. Fitzpatrick. The Bobbs-Merrill Company. $3.50.

This book is a defense of George Washington from the imputations of all previous biographers. As one reads it, one feels that Dr. Fitzpatrick should not have bothered his mind quite so much with the criticisms of Washington which other writers have made. Dr. Fitzpatrick has a tremendous veneration for George Washington, and he succeeds in winning the reader over to an interpretation of Washington as a person of quiet charm and of great force. More than that could not be accomplished for any hero, and it is a pity that Dr. Fitzpatrick did not concentrate more on his own portrait instead of harping so much on those of others who, he feels, were less accurate and less appreciative. The George Washington whom Dr. Fitzpatrick portrays would never have bothered so much with biographical critics as his defender does. Occasionally Dr. Fitzpatrick commits the error of those he condemns by drawing from a document an unwarranted conclusion which he would like it to justify, but he is too much of a scholar to do this without qualification. Another flaw in his book is his intense hatred of Great Britain and the British, which he may have tried to hide, but without success. It does not make us trust his book to find his impartiality sometimes put to rout by his prejudices. Congress, Massachusetts generally, and the Adams family particularly are among Dr. Fitzpatrick's dislikes, and he makes very little effort to interpret or even to understand the point of view of any of Washington's opponents or even of those who differed from him only slightly. He prefers to assume that Congress, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson were devices of the devil manufactured for the purpose of plaguing his hero, Washington.

The Dance

The Persistence of Ballet

WACHTANG CHABUKANI and his partner, Vecheslova, made a surprising debut at Carnegie Hall. These initial Soviet artists were accorded a welcome as stormily enthusiastic and as innocently confused as their own dances. An audience dedicated to the cordial purpose of a bright red welcome did not allow the curious obsolescence of what was seen on the stage to deter their bravos for a second. And they were quite right. Such dancing, that is, such dance-training, such physical education, has not been seen in New York since 1916. Chabukani can do anything the mind of an imaginative choreographer could design. It is a great pity no such choreographer was forthcoming to use those unstaggered great leaps, those flashing turns, and above all the huge side jump, when he landed on one long length of knee and leg as easily as air. Lunacharsky was firm about preserving the indigenous forms of art that were the Soviets' inheritance from the Empire. The wonderful Russian training for ballet is healthily intact. The Russians are still, without a doubt, the greatest dancers in the Western world.

But this conservation of a school without any interest in its aesthetic use is sad. Ballet in modern Russia is not even

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the old ballet of thirty years ago, the long miracle of Petipa's variations before Fokine's dawn. It is a new kind of taste, now a Soviet chic, of which Chabukani generously partakes. Bumptious, with a vocabulary of gesture as limited as an acrobat's, fresh, naive as a night-club dancer, his numbers were well calculated to give pleasure to the simple masses of the new democracy. The old despots created a taste of such rich perfection, such lavish reference, that they paid for it with their lives. Factory workers, soldiers, and peasants have passed upon these later dances and found them perfect. The only standards to which they testify are perfect technique and good clean fun. But Russia is safe. The "art" end of it will come in time. With such instruments as Chabukani a new Russian ballet is more than possible; it is inevitable. The only question is the interval of time.

In this interval the white Russian refugees in Paris have been taking care of the "art" end of it. And often one is inclined to wish they had not. The Monte Carlo Ballet has been having an equivocal success in New York. This has been absent-mindedly attributed to the frank remarks of our most distinguished dance critic, John Martin of the New York *Times*. Mr. Martin needs no defense from anyone. His rich information and love of dancing have kept a large, eager public expectant for dancing. No, the Monte Carlo Ballet has not repeated its huge London success for good reasons, not for bad ones.

In the first place, it is a company of an interregnum. The old stars of the Diaghileff company, the backbone of this organization, work too hard. Nine times a week is ruinous for anyone. The younger members are uneven. The troupe is without any real spirit save a commercial one. Its finest male dancer, Yurek Shablevsky, is effaced in the corps de ballet. A feeling of insecurity, uneasiness, and distrust pervades even the stage. The repertory is not entirely interesting. Of some historical interest are the numbers taken from the Diaghileff repertory. But this brings up a serious question as to the wisdom of repeating masterpieces without the equivalent dancers of their original creation. "Petroushka" without Nijinsky and Karsavina is not unthinkable, but on second sight, there is a blur, a paler impression, and one unfairly blames the program for an impossible lack of excellence. "Igor" was well danced even in front of the faded scenery, and "Les Sylphides," in spite of the fact that the company has no first-rate male dancer in the classical line, it is always a privilege to see again.

It was a major error on the part of the management to imagine that a New York audience was backward. While we have not seen much ballet lately, so much painting and music have come our way from Paris in the last ten years that the addition of some dancing is not necessarily an alleviation. "Les Presages" failed, not because it was not understood, but because its nightmare tastelessness was understood too well. "The Beach" had little success, not because it was so daring, but because it was an antique of 1933. New York is a far less snobbish audience than Paris, and though not yet as fanatic as London for dancing, it has often the healthy unimpressed accuracy of the pages of *Variety*. The Monte Carlo Ballet has one crippling lack—a guiding hand, a correlating force, a restraining taste, an energy behind it dominated by a passion for dancing. Perhaps Diaghileff lost his dominance in the last years, but it is something to think on that the only trace of policy in the only ballet company in the Western Hemisphere comes from Diaghileff five years after his death. Such a momentum as he started twenty-five years ago does not easily slow down.

The one single popular success was "La Concurrence," with fine danceable music by Auric, costumes as sunny as a parade by Derain, and the touching and witty dances of Georges Balanchine. Ironic, solid, and consecutive, it is the only new ballet so far given here which shows a respect for the given material in terms of what it is possible for the dancers to

□ PLAYS □ FILMS □

THE THEATRE GUILD *presents*
EUGENE O'NEILL'S comedy
AH, WILDERNESS!
with GEORGE M. COHAN
GUILD THEATRE Fifty-second Street, West of Broadway
Eves. 8:20—Mats. Thurs. and Sat., 2:20

MAXWELL ANDERSON'S new play
MARY OF SCOTLAND
with
HELEN HAYES PHILIP MERIVALE HELEN MENKEN
ALVIN THEATRE — 52nd Street, West of Broadway —
Eves. 8:20, Mats. Thurs. & Sat., 2:20

EUGENE O'NEILL'S new play
Days Without End
HENRY MILLER's Theater 43 St. E. of B'way—Eves. 8:40
Matinees Thurs. & Sat. 2:40

The Group Theatre and Sidney Harmon and James R. Ullman present Sidney Kingsley's play
MEN IN WHITE
An experience thrilling and absorbing, genuine and complete.—*J. W. KRUTCH, The Nation.*
BROADHURST THEATRE—44th St. W. of Broadway
Eves. 50c to $2.50. Mats. Wed. & Sat.

PEACE ON EARTH *AN ANTI-WAR PLAY*
SIDNEY HOWARD: "Real Theater, the like of which is not on Broadway."
HARRY F. WARD: "I am urging everybody to see it immediately."
CIVIC REPERTORY THEATRE, 14th St. & 6th Ave.
Lowest Priced HIT in New York 30c to $1.50 No Tax
Eves. 8:45. Mats. Wed. & Sat., 2:45

"The Theatre has unleashed one of its thunderbolts under Jed Harris's direction."
BROOKS ATKINSON—*N. Y. Times.*
Jed Harris Production
***The* Green Bay Tree**
CORT THEATRE, 48th St. E. of B'way
Mats. Wed. and Saturday 2:30

Beginning Saturday, Jan. 27—First American Showing
THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL TALKIE!
"HELL ON EARTH"
HENRI BARBUSSE says: "The greatest of all anti-war films"
From the book by Leonhard Frank. Produced in four different countries, spoken in four languages, mainly English.
Featuring WLADIMER SOKOLOFF, of the Moscow Art Theatre, ERNST BUSCH (now in exile)—Directed by VICTOR TRIVAS
ACME THEATRE 14th ST. and UNION SQ. Midnight Show Every Saturday
Rendezvous of the Intelligentsia

"I WAS A SPY" Beg. Saturday January 27th
with Herbert Marshall, Madeleine Carroll, Conrad Veidt
Ranks with "Henry VIII" Among England's Foremost Screen Achievements
PLAZA, 58TH STREET E. OF MADISON AVE. Intelligent Movie Entertainment in Distinctive Surroundings Direction Leo Brecher

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

do. Balanchine's "Cotillion," strange, acrid, and febrile, will show another side of his wonderful romantic gift.

However moderately the Monte Carlo Ballet is received, the principal thing to consider is that ballet, against the wishes of all dilettante "group dancers" and self-expressers, is not dead. It is very much alive. It is the basis, in the West at least, of stage dancing. It remains the rejectable alternative, like academic anatomy for the sculptor or painter, logic for the philosopher, and finger-exercises for the pianist. Ballet is not something one can dismiss by saying, "I've seen the Monte Carlo Ballet and I don't like ballet." It exists in spite of one's likes or dislikes. The uses to which it is accidentally put are something else again. For this reason it is very satisfactory to know that America at last has the possibility of gaining a complete education in dancing with ballet as a basis and a permanent company as its focus. The School of the American Ballet, under M. Balanchine, offers to any interested person all the perfected materials of a dancer's craft. The school is truly national and in a short time will offer another proof of the vitality of a four-hundred-year-old form.

The ritual of classical dancing is as flexible and effective as the staged ceremonies of a religious utility. The exercises which are its basis are entirely functional—to develop the greatest potential of an extended human silhouette, to release the body into a motion, precise, brilliant, and capable of repetition. It is designed entirely from the point of view of an audience in relation to dancers on the stage. LINCOLN KIRSTEIN

Drama

Two Strange Plays

"COME OF AGE," Clemence Dane's new play at the Maxine Elliott Theater, is based upon an odd and perhaps too elaborate fancy. The author has imagined that the poet Chatterton, regretting his premature suicide, made a bargain with death, and that he was, accordingly, reincarnated as a young man of today in order that he might learn something of "life" before he was compelled to leave it for good. As one might expect, "life" is assumed to be an unhappy affair of the heart, and so the poet, reborn, dies once more after he has suffered disillusion at the hands of a woman.

Judith Anderson plays, with considerable virtuosity, the role of the lady whose affections are genuine though unstable. Stephen Haggard, a young Englishman hitherto unknown to Broadway, also gives a very good account of himself as the hero—even though he is, perhaps, just a shade too romantically young, just a fraction too starry-eyed and tremulous of voice. Yet despite moments of charm and others quite genuinely moving, the play never seems entirely to justify its own pretensions. Everything about it is elaborately artificial. Sometimes the dialogue falls into tripping rhyme, often the action is accompanied by a musical score very pleasing in itself. But one has always the feeling that there ought to be either more matter or less art, and in the absence of the former we get only something a bit too near to mere preciosity. There is little beyond the playwright's word to make us believe that her modern young man is really the poet reincarnated. We see him dead in his eighteenth-century garret and we hear his dialogue with Death. But when he reappears at a cocktail party in modern London he seems to bring very little of his old self with him, and it is not easy to remember that his adventure with a contemporary vamp is supposed to mean more than it seems to mean. Perhaps that, indeed, is the best explanation of the fact that "Come of Age" remains always a little weak. Its story is commonplace at bottom, and neither highly literary writing nor the unconvincing pretext that it is about a great poet can make it seem less thin than it is.

Charles Robinson's "Mahogany Hall" (Bijou Theater) is another curiosity but of a very different sort. One may safely guess that it was written before "Sailor, Beware!" of which Mr. Robinson is coauthor, and one would merely dismiss it with a smile were it not for the fact that it is obviously written with the deadly seriousness of the very young. The theme is the theme of the noble prostitute, but Mr. Robinson's drama goes all the similar plays from "Camille" to "Rain" several better. He asks us to believe not merely in one soiled lily but in a whole bawdy house full of pure if unfortunate girls, and he leaves behind the general impression that the typical tart (the word, used with great bitterness, is his) will be found on close acquaintance to embody all the Victorian virtues. No wonder there is a young man hanging about to abduct little Tangie into respectability, or that Madam has had much difficulty in preserving her personnel intact, for Mahogany Hall is obviously the place where any discerning young man would go to look for a wife. Even the bartender is a kindly soul and the piano-player a starving genius whose plight, one is glad to see, touches the somewhat calloused heart of the proprietress herself. It is not strange that "Sailor, Beware!" should be a successful burlesque if Mr. Robinson can be so funny without even trying. Incidentally, it would be interesting to see Olga Baclanova in a good play. She comes to this one straight out of "Murder at The Vanities."

"Wednesday's Child" (Longacre Theater) ought to be better than it is. It deals with divorce as seen through the eyes of a sensitive child and is written with a sincerity considerably more effective than that of the piece just discussed. Nevertheless, I found it too consistently according to expectations to be profoundly interesting. When a play deals with distressing events, one quite rightly asks a good deal more by way of compensation than one would otherwise demand. "Wednesday's Child" hardly gives enough.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Contributors to This Issue

LOUIS FISCHER is *The Nation's* Moscow correspondent.

HENRY HAZLITT, formerly associate editor of *The Nation*, is editor of the *American Mercury*.

LUDWIG LORE was formerly editor of the New York *Volks-Zeitung*.

OLIVER WHITWELL WILSON is a New York architect and a member of the City Plan Committee of the City Club.

JEROME COUNT is a member of the New York bar who has frequently represented utility employees.

STELLA HANAU is editor of the *Birth Control Review*.

JOHN ROTHSCHILD, director of the Open Road, is a confirmed explorer of out-of-the-way Europe.

HORACE GREGORY is the author of "Pilgrim of the Apocalypse. A Critical Study of D. H. Lawrence."

FLORENCE CODMAN is a regular contributor of reviews to *The Nation*.

G. P. GOOCH, joint editor of the *Contemporary Review*, is the author of a number of books on the history of modern Europe.

MARY AUSTIN, poet, novelist, and critic, lives at Santa Fé, New Mexico.

LINCOLN KIRSTEIN, one of the editors of *Hound and Horn*, has written a life of Fokine and collaborated with Madame Nijinsky on a life of her husband.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED